


THE ASSUMPTION
OF MOSES

R. H. CHARLES

the
will be
from A.C.



~~42b2a~~.



PRESS OPINIONS.

THE APOCALYPSE OF BARUCH.

Translated from the Syriac.

BY REV. R. H. CHARLES.

Crown 8vo, cloth, price 7s. 6d. net.

“Mr. Charles’s last work will have a hearty welcome from students of Syriac whose interest is linguistic, and from theological students who have learned the value of Jewish and Christian pseudepigraphy ; and the educated general reader will find much of high interest in it, regard being had to its date and its theological standpoint.”—*Record*.

“Mr. Charles has in this work followed up the admirable editions of other pieces of apocalyptic literature with an edition equally admirable. Some of the notes on theological or other points of special interest are very full and instructive. The whole work is an honour to English scholarship. . . . The work before us is one that no future student of the apocalyptic literature will be able to neglect, and students of the New Testament or the contemporary Jewish thought will find much to interest them in it.”—*Primitive Methodist Quarterly Review*.

“As is intimated in the title-page, the Syriac text, based on ten MSS., from which the Epistle of Baruch is translated, is included in the volume. The learned footnotes which accompany the translation throughout will be found most helpful to the reader. Indeed, nothing seems to have been left undone which could make this ancient writing intelligible to the student.”—*Scotsman*.

“To say that this is *the* edition of the Apocalypse of Baruch is to say nothing. Let us say that it is an edition which alone would give an editor a name to live.”—*Expository Times*.

“It is a book that should be mastered by every student of the New Testament.”—*Westminster Review*.

“Mr. Charles’s new work, ‘The Apocalypse of Baruch,’ which he is the first to edit from the Syriac in a form accessible to English readers, is the best example that English literature has ever had of the modern analysis of ancient books ; and those to whom such criticism is still obscure cannot do better than study the way in which the artist unravels the tangled skein of authorship in the most beautiful of all the Apocalypses that have come down to us. He has certainly written a very valuable work, for which the students of apocalyptic literature will give him their hearty thanks.”—*Expositor*.

THE
ASSUMPTION OF MOSES

OTHER WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

THE APOCALYPSE OF BARUCH.—Translated from the Syriac: Chapters I.-LXXVII. from the Sixth Century MS. in the Ambrosian Library of Milan, and Chapters LXXVIII.-LXXXVII.—*THE EPISTLE OF BARUCH.*—From a New and Critical Text based on Ten MSS. and published herewith. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Indices. 7s. 6d. net.

LONDON: A. & C. BLACK.

THE BOOK OF ENOCH.—Translated from Dillmann's Ethiopic Text (emended and revised in accordance with hitherto uncollated Ethiopic MSS. and with the Gizeh and other Greek and Latin Fragments), with Introduction, Notes, and Indices. 8vo, 16s.

THE ETHIOPIC VERSION OF THE HEBREW BOOK OF JUBILEES.—Edited from Four MSS. and critically revised, emended, and restored in accordance with the Hebrew, Syriac, Greek, and Latin Fragments of this Book. 4to, 12s. 6d.

THE BOOK OF THE SECRETS OF ENOCH.—Translated from the Slavonic by W. R. MORFILL, M.A., and edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Indices, by R. H. CHARLES, M.A. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

OXFORD: THE CLARENDON PRESS.

745c
1128

THE ASSUMPTION OF MOSES

TRANSLATED FROM THE LATIN SIXTH
CENTURY MS., THE UNEMENDED TEXT
OF WHICH IS PUBLISHED HEREWITH,
TOGETHER WITH THE TEXT IN ITS
RESTORED AND CRITICALLY EMENDED
FORM

EDITED
WITH INTRODUCTION, NOTES, AND INDICES

BY

R. H. CHARLES, M.A.

TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN, AND EXETER COLLEGE, OXFORD



LONDON
ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK

1897

[*All Rights Reserved*]

TO
MY FATHER AND MOTHER

PREFACE

WRITTEN in Hebrew shortly after the beginning of the Christian era, this book was designed by its author to protest against the growing secularisation of the Pharisaic party through its fusion with political ideals and popular Messianic beliefs. Its author, a Pharisaic Quietist, sought herein to recall his party to the old paths, which they were fast forsaking, of simple unobtrusive obedience to the Law. He glorifies, accordingly, the old ideals which had been cherished and pursued by the Chasid and Early Pharisaic party, but which the Pharisaism of the first century B.C. had begun to disown in favour of a more active rôle in the life of the nation. He foresaw, perhaps, the doom to which his country was hurrying under such a shortsighted and unspiritual policy, and laboured with all his power to stay its downward progress. But all in vain. He but played afresh the part of Cassandra. The leavening of Pharisaism with

earthly political ideals went on apace, and the movement thus initiated culminated finally in the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans in 70 A.D.

It adds no little to the interest of the book that it was written during the early life of our Lord, or possibly contemporaneously with His public ministry. At all events, it was known to the writers of Jude 9, 16 and Acts vii., and most probably to the writers of 2 Peter ii. 10–11 and Matthew xxiv. 29 (Luke xxi. 25–26).

It may be well here to indicate the features in which this edition differs from previous editions of the Assumption. These consist (1) in a fuller and more critical treatment of the Latin text, and of the Greek and Semitic background which it presupposes; (2) in an exegesis of the text at once more comprehensive and detailed.

I. *The Latin Text.*—The Latin text has been critically edited and emended four times in Germany. But three of these editions have failed to recognise the Semitic background of the Latin text, and have thus limited their horizon. The fourth—that of Schmidt-Merx—which has shown ample recognition of this fact, is often brilliant indeed, but oftener arbitrary, alike in its emendations and restorations. With a view to carrying forward the criticism of the Latin text, the present editor has tabulated the peculiar Latin forms it contains, and

compared them with like forms in the fifth-century Latin MS. of the Gospels, *k*, and also given the appropriate references to Rönsch's *Itala und Vulgata* and Schuchardt's *Vokalismus des Vulgär-Lateins*. The idiosyncrasies of the text have likewise been carefully summarised, and its derivation from the Greek exhibited on grounds in many respects new. At the next stage of the investigation I have been obliged to part company with all scholars but Rosenthal in my advocacy of a Hebrew original. That the book was derived from a Semitic original, it is no longer possible to doubt. That the language in question was Aramaic is, owing to the advocacy of Schmidt-Merx, now generally accepted, but, as it appears to me, on inadequate grounds; for I have shown, I believe, that it is possible to explain, from the standpoint of a Hebrew original, most of the crucial passages adduced by Schmidt-Merx in favour of an Aramaic, and that the remaining passages have no evidential value on the question at issue. I have shown further, I hope, that whereas many of the passages admit of explanation on either hypothesis, there are several which are explicable only on that of a Hebrew original.

II. *The Exegesis*.—The work done in this direction has been very inadequate. Short studies, indeed, from time to time, have appeared in Germany and England, but these have in every

instance confined themselves to one or more of the salient features and main statements of the book. The occasional explanatory notes in the editions of Volkmar, Hilgenfeld, and Schmidt-Merx are, though often most helpful and suggestive, open to the same criticism. This exegetic meagreness of past scholarship on the subject has made the task of the present editor more arduous than might have been expected. It has, however, been beneficial in necessitating a first-hand study of all the questions involved in the text. As a result of this study, I have been obliged to differ from all preceding scholars on the interpretation of several of the most important facts and chapters in the book. With what success I must leave to others to determine.

As a help to the reader, I should add that the exegetical notes are placed under the English translation and the critical under the Latin text. This practice, however, is occasionally broken through.

Finally, I wish here to express my deep gratitude to Dr. Cheyne for his revision of my proofs of a Hebrew original, and for suggestions connected therewith, and also to Dr. Sutherland Black for his revision of the entire book in proof, as well as for numerous corrections.

17 BRADMORE ROAD, OXFORD,
April 1897.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	xiii-lxv

§ 1. Short Account of the Book (pp. xiii-xiv).—

§ 2. Other Books of Moses (pp. xiv-xvii).—§ 3.

Editions of the Latin Text—Ceriani, Hilgenfeld, Volkmar, Schmidt and Merx, Fritzsche (pp. xviii-

xxi).—§ 4. Critical Inquiries—Ewald, Langen,

Hilgenfeld, Haupt, Rönsch, Philippi, Colani,

Carriere, Wieseler, Geiger, Heidenheim, Haus-

rath, Stähelin, Drummond, Reuss, Dillmann,

Rosenthal, Schürer, Baldensperger, Deane,

Thomson, De Faye, Briggs (pp. xxi-xxviii).—

§ 5. The Latin Version of the Assumption: Its Linguistic Character—Palæography and Syntax, and Critical Worth (pp. xxviii-xxxvi).—§ 6.

The Latin Version—a Translation from the Greek: for (1) Greek Words are transliterated;

(2) Greek Idioms survive in the Latin; (3) we

must at times translate, not the Latin Text, but

the Greek which it presupposes, but which was

misrendered by the Latin translator; (4)

through retranslation into Greek, the source of

the incoherencies of the Text can, in some cases,

be discovered; Fragments of the Greek still

survive (pp. xxxvi-xxxviii).—§ 7. The Greek—

a translation from the Hebrew Original: for (1)

Hebrew idiomatic Phrases survive in the Latin; (2)

Hebrew syntactical Idioms probably survive;

(3) we must at times translate, not the Latin Text, but the Hebrew presupposed by it; (4) frequently it is only through retranslation into Hebrew that we can understand the source of the corruptions in the Text and remove them; (5) Paronomasiæ appear on retranslation into Hebrew (pp. xxxviii-xlv).—§ 8. The present Book in reality a Testament of Moses. The original Assumption preserved only in a few Greek quotations (pp. xlv-1).—§ 9. Dislocation of Chapters VIII.-IX. in the Latin Text from their original position after Chapter V. (p. li).—§ 10. The Author—not a Sadducee, Zealot, or Essene, but a Pharisaic Quietist (pp. li-liv).—§ 11. The Date (pp. lv-lviii).—§ 12. Views of the Author on Moses, Israel, the Messianic Kingdom, Good Works (pp. lviii-lxi).—§ 13. New Testament and later Writers acquainted with the Assumption (pp. lxii-lxv).

THE ASSUMPTION OF MOSES—TRANSLATION AND EXEGETICAL NOTES	1-51
THE LATIN VERSION OF THE ASSUMPTION OF MOSES CRITICALLY REVISED AND EMENDED, TOGETHER WITH THE UNEMENDED LATIN TEXT OF THE SIXTH CENTURY MS. IN THE MILAN LIBRARY	53-101
THE ASSUMPTION OF MOSES—SURVIVING ONLY IN A FEW GREEK FRAGMENTS	103-110
APPENDIX ON I. 8	111
INDEX I.—PASSAGES FROM THE SCRIPTURES AND OTHER ANCIENT BOOKS DIRECTLY CONNECTED OR CLOSELY PARALLEL WITH THE TEXT	113
INDEX II.—NAMES AND SUBJECTS	114-117

INTRODUCTION

§ 1. SHORT ACCOUNT OF THE BOOK

THE Assumption of Moses was, in all probability, a composite work, and consisted of two originally distinct books, of which the first was really the Testament of Moses, and the second the Assumption. The former was written in Hebrew, between 7 and 29 A.D., and possibly also the latter. A Greek version of the entire work appeared in the first century A.D. Of this a few phrases and sentences have been preserved in St. Matt. xxiv. 29; Acts vii. 35; St. Jude 9, 16, 18 (?), the Apocalypse of Baruch, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and other Greek writers. The fragments in the Greek writers are printed below (pp. 107–109). The Greek version was translated into Latin not later than the fifth century. That such a Latin version ever existed was unknown to the modern world till nearly forty years ago, when a large fragment of it was discovered by Ceriani in a sixth-century MS. in the Ambrosian Library in Milan.

The book was written by a Pharisaic Quietist, and forms a noble but ineffectual protest against the growing Zelotic spirit of the party. Its author was a learned Jew, well versed in the Scriptures, and intimately acquainted with the history of his nation subsequent to the close of the canon. He was full of patriotism; thus he looks for the return of the ten tribes, the establishment of the theocratic kingdom, the triumph of Israel over its foes, and its final exaltation to heaven, whence it should see its enemies weltering in the fires of gehenna. But though a patriot, he is not a Zealot; the duty of the faithful is not to resort to arms, but simply to keep the law and prepare, through repentance, for the personal intervention of God in their behalf.

§ 2. OTHER BOOKS OF MOSES

There has been a large and very diverse literature bearing the name of Moses. As it furnishes little or no help to the explanation of the present book, I shall content myself here with a simple enumeration of the various Apocryphal books of Moses that have appeared in Jewish, Christian, and Gnostic literature.

I. *In Jewish literature*—(a) In Hebrew, (b) in Greek, (c) in Arabic, (d) in Slavonic.

- (a) *Midrash Tanchuma Debarim*, translated into German by Wünsche (1882).

Petirath Moshe (פטרית משה), ed. by Gilb. Gaultmyn (Paris, 1629), with a Latin translation. This translation was subsequently published in 1714 by J. A. Fabricius, and in 1840 by Gfrörer, *Prophetæ veteres pseudepigraphi*, pp. 303, 304. Two other recensions of this Midrash have been published by Jellinek, *Beth - ha - Midrash* (1853), i. 115–129; (1877), vi. 71–78. Some of these books I have not been able to see. On these legends, see also Beer, *Leben Moses nach Auffassung der jüdischen Sage* (Leipzig, 1863); Benedetto, *Vita e Morte di Mose* (Pisa, 1879); Zunz, *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge*, p. 146.

- (b) Philo's *Vita Mosis*, p. 39; and Josephus, *Ant.* iv. 8. 4, 48.

Βίβλος Λόγων Μυστικῶν Μωυσέως. This book is distinguished from the Assumption in the Acts of the Nicene Council, II. 18, where, after mentioning the latter, these proceed: *καὶ ἐν βίβλῳ Λόγων Μυστικῶν Μωυσέως, αὐτὸς Μωυσῆς προεῖπε περὶ τοῦ Δαβὶδ καὶ Σαλομῶντος, οὕτως προεῖπε· καὶ διαδοχεύσει εἰς αὐτὸν ὁ Θεὸς σοφίαν καὶ δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἐπιστήμην πλήρη· αὐτὸς οἰκοδομήσει τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς*. I have

classed this book as a Jewish work, but the evidence tells neither way.

- (c) In Arabic. Dr. Leitner has translated into German (*Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift* (1871), pp. 184–212) from the Arabic, a Samaritan Apocalypse of Moses. I have found it useful in the explanation of IX. 1 of our book.
- (d) In Slavonic, as Mr. Morfill has kindly informed me, there is a book entitled “The Exodus of Moses,” or more fully, “The Life of the holy Prophet Moses, and how he ruled among the Saracens, and how he resisted King Pharaoh and Balaam the Wizard, and how he brought the People out of Egypt,” Tichonravov, *Pamiatniki otrenchennoi russkoi literaturi*, i. p. 233 sqq. (1863). This writing has no connection with our Assumption. It is very rabbinic in character, and possesses many such features in common with Josephus’s account of Moses. Mr. Morfill will shortly publish the translation of this work.

II. *In Christian literature.*

Apocalypsis Mosis, in Tischendorf’s “Apocalypses apocryphae” (1866), pp. 1–23; Ceriani, *Monument. Sacr.*, V. i. pp. 21–24. An Armenian version has also been published in

the *Uncanonical Books of the Old Testament*, by the Mechitarists at Venice, pp. 1–23 (see James's *Apocrypha anecdota*, ii. 158, 159, whence I have derived this last reference). This book really belongs to the Adamic literature (see Rönsch, *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, pp. 470–474; Dillmann, *Herzog's R.-E.*, xii. pp. 366, 367).

Apocryphum Mosis (Ἀπόκρυφον Μωυσέως). According to Euthalius (Zaccagni's *Collectanea monumentorum veterum* (1698), p. 561), Photius (*Amphil.* 183), and Syncellus (ed. Bonn, i. p. 48), St. Paul derived Gal. vi. 16, οὔτε περιτομή τι ἐστὶν οὔτε ἀκροβυστία ἀλλὰ καινὴ κτίσις, from this Apocryph. There can be no doubt that the borrowing is just the other way, and that this Apocryph is a Christian composition, of the general contents of which we have no knowledge.

Story of Moses. This is found in Armenian (see James's *Apocrypha anecdota*, ii. p. 160).

III. *In Gnostic literature.*

See Epiphanius, *Hær.* XXXIX. 5, where it is said that the Sethites used certain Books of Moses in addition to others attributed to Abraham and other Old Testament worthies.

§ 3. EDITIONS OF THE LATIN TEXT

Ceriani, *Monumenta sacra et profana*, vol. i. fasc. i. (1861), pp. 55–64. To this scholar belongs the honour of discovering and identifying these fragments of the lost Assumption of Moses. In this edition of the text Ceriani contented himself with reproducing the text. This he did with such accuracy that subsequent inquiries, conducted by Volkmar, relative to the reading of certain passages, failed to lead to any material improvement on Ceriani's printed edition (see Appendix C, Volkmar's edition).

Hilgenfeld, *Novum Testamentum extra canonem receptum*, 1st ed. (1866), pp. 93–115; 2nd ed. (1876), pp. 107–135. To this great scholar we owe the finest textual work that has been produced on this book. Much of it is of permanent value, and many of his emendations are accepted as final. His contention, however, that the book was written originally in Greek, has, of necessity, limited the range of his vision, and barred the way to further progress. But fault-finding is ungracious where such high services have been rendered, and particularly in the case of one who has not only done the best work within his self-limited province, but has also been the first to do it. Ceriani, indeed, was the first to publish the text, but

Hilgenfeld the book, as he himself rightly claims : "Antonio M. Ceriano . . . codicis latini, non libri ipsius primam editionem debemus" (*Mess. Jud.*, Proleg. p. lxx, note).

In the *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftl. Theol.* (1868), pp. 273-309, 356, and in his *Messias Judaeorum* (1869), pp. 435-468, Hilgenfeld has retranslated the Latin into Greek, and on the whole with admirable success. On many passages I have found occasion to differ with him. In the sequel the reader will find a number of these, where the critical treatment of the text presupposes a Greek background diverging from that supplied by Hilgenfeld.

Volkmar, *Mose Prophetie und Himmelfahrt, eine Quelle für das Neue Testament, zum erstenmale deutsch herausgegeben im Zusammenhang der Apokrypha und der Christologie überhaupt* (Leipzig, 1867). This writer has made some undoubted contributions to the emendation of the book, and occasionally to its interpretation. But his work is disfigured by many errors, and at times by gross ignorance. His well-known partiality for a certain period of history intervenes here also, and leads him to wrest facts into accordance with his preconceived theories.

Schmidt and Merx, "Die Assumptio Mosis, mit Einleitung und erklärenden Anmerkungen herausgegeben" (Merx, *Archiv für wissenschaftliche Erforschung des Alten Testaments*, I. ii. (1868), pp. 111-

152). In this learned study Schmidt-Merx have rightly shown that the original of our book must have been written not in Greek, but in Semitic—according to their view, in Aramaic. They were not, indeed, the first to recognise a Semitic original, but they were the first to apply this hypothesis consistently and continuously in the interpretation of the Latin text. For some review of their arguments in favour of an Aramaic as against a Hebrew original, see p. xxxix.

Their emendations and restorations of the Latin are not unfrequently happy, but at times they are wholly beside the mark and unreasonable. How, for instance, are we to explain the correction of the Semitic idiom, *facient facientes*, into the unmeaning in *faciem facientes*, by editors who are advocating a Semitic original? That Hilgenfeld, Volkmar, and Fritzsche should remove this Hebraism from their texts by correction is intelligible from their standpoint; but on what principle can we explain the action of these editors? Their treatment of the text in other passages is just as arbitrary. It must be conceded, however, that their work, though often untrustworthy, is always stimulating and suggestive.

Fritzsche, *Libri apocryphi Vet. Testamenti graece* (1871), pp. 700–730. In this very serviceable edition, Fritzsche prints on one page the text as

originally published by Ceriani, and facing it, on the opposite page, an emended text with critical footnotes. This work is based mainly on the labours of Hilgenfeld, Volkmar, and Schmidt-Merx. To their contributions to the recovery of the text Fritzsche has added some of his own. It is a saner text than that of Schmidt-Merx, but not half so brilliant.

§ 4. CRITICAL INQUIRIES

Under the head of each of the following writers on the Assumption, his most characteristic contributions or views are briefly given.

Ewald, *Göttinger gelehrte Anzeigen* (1862), vol. i. pp. 4-7, (1867), pp. 110-118, 1416-1429; *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vol. vi. 51-61 (Eng. trans.). Ewald regards our book as derived from a Semitic original (Hebrew or Aramaic). It was written by a Zealot a few years after the death of Herod the Great, and subsequent to the rising of Judas the Gaulonite. The "slaves, sons of slaves," are the Maccabean high priests, and chap. VII. is directed against the Pharisees.

Langen, *Das Judenthum in Palästina* (1866), pp. 102-111; Reusch's *Theolog. Literaturbl.* (1871), No. 3. Langen holds that the Assumption was written in Palestine in Hebrew, and shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D.

Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. f. wissensch. Theol.* (1867), pp. 217–223 ; *Messias Judaeorum* (1869), Prolegom. lxx.–lxxvi. See also the books quoted under his name on pp. xviii–xix. The Assumption was written in Greek by a Roman Jew in the West *circa* 44–45 A.D. Chap. VII. is to be interpreted of the Herodian princes. The exegetical side of Hilgenfeld's work is weak compared with the textual.

Haupt, "Bemerkungen zu der editio princeps der Himmelfahrt des Moses," *Z.f.W.T.* (1867), p. 448. These remarks consist of a few emendations of the Latin text.

Rönsch has made many contributions to the study of the Assumption. Some of these are of great value, especially those which deal with the Latin Version purely from the linguistic side. Others, which are devoted to the emendation of the text, are less good, though occasionally his restorations are very felicitous. These subjects are treated of in the *Z.f.W.T.*, vol. xi. (1868), pp. 76–108, xiv. (1871), pp. 89–92. In vol. xi. pp. 466–468, he suggests certain corrections and changes to be made in Hilgenfeld's retranslation into Greek. The various names under which the Assumption has appeared are discussed in *Z.f.W.T.*, vol. xii. (1869), pp. 213–228. In the 17th volume of the *Zeitschrift*, pp. 542–562, he addresses himself to the exegesis of this book, and then again returns

to the emendation of the text. The exegesis could hardly be more unsatisfactory, and the impression left by these, his later attempts at emendation, cannot be said to be much better. In six pages of emendations, only one or two appear probable. I here append a specimen of his work. For the well-known corrupt word *putavimus* in VII. 8, Rönsch proposes *laetabimus* or *litabimus*, or *adjutabimus*, or *si lutabimus*, or *exaltabimus*, but ultimately prefers *perpotabimus*. Rönsch returned once again to this subject in vol. xxviii. of the same *Zeitschrift* (1885), pp. 102–104. For further references to this book, see his *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, 273, 380, 480–482.

Philippi, *Das Buch Henoch* (1868), pp. 166–191. This writer assigns the composition of this book to the second century of our era, and interprets chap. VII. of the Pharisees.

Colani, “L’Assomption de Moïse” (*Revue de Théologie*, vol. iv. (1868), pp. 65–94). This scholar thinks that Schmidt-Merx have made it impossible any longer to doubt the Aramaic origin of the book. With Volkmar, he regards chap. VIII. as historical and concerned with the tragic history of the Jews under Hadrian, and IX. as a veiled account of the action of Rabbi Jehuda ben Baba, who, after ordaining seven of his disciples in a narrow gorge near Usha, was put to death by the Romans. This rabbi is the Taxo in IX. 1. Chap. VI. contains an

indictment of the Jewish Doctors of Jabneh and Usha. Hence the book was written *c.* 137–138. As for its silence regarding the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., he thinks this quite immaterial. This book was the work not of an Essene, nor a Zealot, but was the manifesto of a writer who felt that Israel could do alike without the temple or its national independence, since it could find its satisfaction in those elements of the cult which were independent of the temple. This very clever, but most inconclusive, treatise concludes with the words: “Toute difficulté, je crois se trouve levée!”

Carriere, “Note sur le Taxo de l’Assumption de Moïse” (*Revue de Théol.* (1868), pp. 94–96). See my *Commentary*, p. 35.

Wieseler, “Die jüngst aufgefundene Aufnahme Moses nach Ursprung und Inhalt untersucht” (*Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie* (1868), pp. 622–648). Wieseler thinks that our book was written by a Zealot, in Hebrew (?), shortly after the war of Varus. His interpretation of chap. VII. will be found on p. 24 in my notes, and of Taxo on p. 35.

Geiger, *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben*, vol. vi. (1868), pp. 41–47. Geiger takes chap. VII. to be a description of the Sadducees, adducing such phrases as *regnabunt de his homines pestilentiosi* and *tanquam principes erimus*. In *docentes se esse justos* (צדיקים) there is a play on

their name. The words *noli me tangere* emphasise their priestly purity.

Heidenheim, "Beiträge zum bessern Verständniss der Ascensio Moysis" (*Vierteljahrschrift für deutsch- und englisch-theologische Forschung und Kritik*, vol. iv. (1871), pp. 63–102). This is the most untrustworthy work it has been my duty to read in all the literature of this book. Occasionally a few helpful references to Jewish literature are given.

Hausrath, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, 2nd ed., iv. pp. 76–80. Hausrath is of opinion that the book was written at Rome in the reign of Domitian in Aramaic.

Stähelin, *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie* (1874), pp. 216–218. The book preaches not a Messiah kingdom, but an O.T. theophany. Michael is to introduce the new order of things.

Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah* (1877), pp. 74–84. We have here a very clear and but too brief account of the Assumption. Dr. Drummond thinks that, "as there is no sufficient reason for supposing a Hebrew or Aramaean original, we may assume that the book, notwithstanding its Hebraic colouring, was composed in Greek." Then follows an able discussion on the date, which he holds to be about 6 A.D.

Reuss, *Geschichte der h. Schriften des Alten Testaments* (1890), pp. 738–740. This writer does not commit himself to a definite date. He thinks that

the words in VI. 7, "He (*i.e.* Herod) will beget children, who succeeding him will rule for shorter periods," do not necessarily determine the date. Philip and Antipater did, it is true, reign longer than their father. "Der Verfasser konnte auch an Archelaus und Agrippa denken die ja allein für einen Jerusalemer Interesse hatten."

Dillmann, art. "Pseudepigraphen," in Herzog's *Real-Encyc.* 2nd ed., xii. 352, 353. Dillmann agrees with Ewald, Wieseler, and Drummond in assigning the composition of this book to the first decade after the death of Herod. The writer was a Zealot and was hostile to the Pharisees, whom he assails in chap. VII. The book was probably written in Aramaic.

Rosenthal, *Vier apocryphische Bücher* (1885), pp. 13-38. This is a very interesting and fresh study of our book. The writer ascribes it to the years immediately succeeding the fall of the temple. The author was a Zealot, and wrote in Hebrew and not in Aramaic. He attempts to prove this thesis by the removal of obscurities or corruptions from the text through retranslation into Hebrew. In only one or two cases, however, is it possible to admit that he is successful. On his view of chapter VII., see my notes, pp. 24, 25.

Schürer, *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Christ* (1886), II. iii. pp. 73-83 (Eng. trans.). We have here an admirable account of this book.

Schürer refers its composition to the first decade after the death of Herod. Its writer was a Zealot, and the *homines pestilentiosi* in VII. are the "Pharisees, to whom every word is unmistakably applicable." A very valuable bibliography is appended.

Baldensperger, *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu* (1888), pp. 25–31. This writer regards the Assumption as a Jewish manifesto, with an apologetic, or rather a secret, polemical aim. This aim is to glorify Moses, the Law, and Judaism over against Christianity. The attributes ascribed to the Founder of Christianity are here, in large measure, assigned to Moses. He is the "mediator" between God and man (I. 14, 17), the high priest who intercedes daily on bended knee (XI. 11), the divine prophet and perfect teacher (XI. 16). The Law is to abide for ever (IV. 2, XII. 13), and Israel always to be pre-eminent (XII. 4). The book was not written before 50 A.D. Its author was a Quietist, and chap. VII. is to be regarded as descriptive of the Roman procurators.

Deane, *Pseudepigrapha* (1891), pp. 95–130. We have here a very full and readable account of our book, which shows a large acquaintance with the literature of the subject. Its author he takes to be a Zealot. It was written very early in the first century. Chap. VII. is directed against the Herodian princes and the Pharisees.

Thomson, *Books which Influenced Our Lord and*

His Apostles (1891), pp. 14, 321–339, 440–450. We have here a scholarly treatment of the Assumption. Its date is fixed at 6 A.D., and its original language as Aramaic. His interpretation of VII. is strange. It is regarded as a description of the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Publicans.

De Faye, *Les Apocalypses Juives* (1892), pp. 67–75. De Faye agrees with Dillmann, Schürer, and others as to the date and the interpretation of chap. VII. The author was a Zealot, whose hopes for Israel were wholly confined to this world. Taxo is the righteous kernel of the nation.

Briggs, *The Messiah of the Apostles* (1895), pp. 5–7, 18. The Assumption is a secret polemic against Christianity. Its very title betrays as much. Its author was a Zealot, who wrote prior to 70 A.D. Taxo and his seven sons are in antithesis to Jesus and His twelve disciples, and are represented as excelling them in self-sacrifice. The law is of perpetual obligation. Its fulfilment is the preparation for the divine advent.

§ 5. THE LATIN VERSION OF THE ASSUMPTION: ITS LINGUISTIC CHARACTER AND CRITICAL WORTH

The solitary MS. of this version was discovered in the Ambrosian Library at Milan by Ceriani, and published by him in his *Mon. sacr. et prof.*, I. i.

55-64, in 1861. This MS. is a palimpsest of the sixth century. It consists of eight folios, written on both sides. There are two columns on each page, and from twelve to eighteen letters in each line. There is no division of words, and the punctuation, which but rarely occurs, is above the line, not on it. Occasionally whole verses are indecipherable. The palimpsest came originally from the Abbey of Bobbio, near Pavia.

Some scholars have supposed that in this MS. we have the actual work of the original translator of the Latin Version, but I shall show presently that this is not so. It is, in fact, only a fragmentary copy of that version. It is not the original version, but only a copy of it; for (*a*) our text contains duplicate renderings and attempts at a better translation, which must primarily have been merely marginal glosses, but were afterwards introduced by a copyist into the text. The clearest example of this is to be found in V. 6, where the dittography extends to six lines in the MS. Other dittographies will be found in VI. 3, VIII. 5, XI. 13. (*b*) Again, in XI. 2 we find an actual correction of the copyist. The text reads, *et hortatus est cum Monse*, but the context requires *et hortatus est eum Monses*. Here, first of all, the copyist took *e* in *eum* to be *c*, and so, finding *cum Monses* to be impossible, emended *Monses* into *Monse*. *Eum* is twice taken

as cum in the Bobbio MS. *k*, in Mt. ix. 1, xiii. 48. (c) Ab his, corrupt for abis (XI. 9), must be due to a Latin copyist, and not to the Latin translator.

The Latin belongs in style and orthography to the fifth century. In order to make this clear I will show that nearly all its chief characteristics can be paralleled from the old fifth-century Bobbio MS. *k* edited in 1886 by Wordsworth, Sanday, and White. I have drawn my examples of *k* from Dr. Sanday's Introduction, pp. xcix-clxvi. This N.T. MS. I shall henceforth refer to simply as *k*. I have likewise used Schuchardt's *Der Vokalismus des Vulgär-Lateins*, and Rösensch's *Itala und Vulgata*, to which I refer the reader occasionally.

We shall now treat of the Latin text under two heads—(i.) Its linguistic character, (ii.) Its critical worth.

(i.) **Linguistic Character.**—This can best be dealt with under two divisions: (a) its palæography and orthography, (b) its syntax.

(a) *Palæography and Orthography.*—Of the vowel and consonantal changes occurring in this MS., some are due to errors of sight, others to errors of sound, while others represent the pronunciation of the time.

ae is found for a in profetiae, I. 5: cf. *k*, Mt. xii. 31, blasfemiae.
ae for e in quaerella, I. 10; quisquae, VI. 1; inconprachensibilis,

XI. 16; praeces, XI. 17; faciae, XI. 18. This is of frequent occurrence in *k*: cf. Mt. iii. 10, saecuris; xiii. 46, praetiosus, etc.

a for e in ad (et), X. 6: cf. *k*, Mt. iii. 3, parata (parate).

a for i in timebat, XI. 12; erant, XI. 14.

a for u in secabantur, VIII. 3. Conversely, u for a in *k*: cf. Mt. xiii. 8, dabunt (dabant).

b for p in scribura, I. 16; elibsis, III. 7: cf. *k*, Mt. viii. 2, lebrosus; cf. Schuchardt, *Vokalismus des Vulgärlateins*, i. 125-126.

c for e in cum, XI. 2: cf. *k*, Mk. x. 10, cum (eum).

c for s in celares, XI. 4, for solaris: cf. *k*, Mk. xv. 38, acutu (a susū). See Schuchardt, *op. cit.* i. 163, cimul (simul).

c for t in tum, III. 11: cf. *k*, Mk. xiii. 21, devocasti (devotasti).

ch for c in chedrio, I. 17. For other instances of this usage see Schuchardt, *op. cit.* i. 73.

d for t in ad (et), X. 6; tali(dari), XI. 12: cf. *k*, Mt. viii. 19, quod (quot); cf. Schuchardt, *op. cit.* i. 125, 126.

e for a in fecit (faciet), II. 4: cf. *k*, Mk. ix. 1, quidem (quidam).

e for ae in scene, I. 7; liena, III. 4; herere, X. 9; que (quae), XI. 4; Amorreī, XI. 16: cf. *k*, Mt. x. 9, es (aes); xi. 21, facte (factae), etc.: cf. Schuchardt, *op. cit.* i. 226-235.

e for i in conterunt, IX. 3, XII. 7: cf. *k*, Mt. x. 22, odebiles; Mk. ix. 32, temebant, etc. See Schuchardt, *op. cit.* ii. 1 *sqq.*

e for o in celaris, XI. 4, for solaris: cf. *k*, Mt. vi. 28, quemodo, etc.

e for u, XII. 6, et (ut).

f for ph always in fynicis, I. 3; profetiae, I. 5 (III. 11, XI. 16); allofilorum, IV. 3; blasphemare, VIII. 5. So always in *k*, as Farisaei, blasphemare, etc.

f for t in ferrum (?), II. 4.

ge for qui in ingenerationibus, V. 3.

i for e in transio, I. 15; dimittes (demittes), II. 2; liena, III. 4; scalciati, XI. 12; ducit (-et), III. 3, and passim: cf. *k*, Mt. vii. 23, recidite (recedite), etc.

i for y in allofilorum, IV. 3; acrobistiam, VIII. 3: cf. Schuchardt, *op. cit.* ii. 256 *sqq.*

m for co in mortes (for coortes (?), *i.e.* cohortes), VI. 8.

o for i in forma, X. 15: cf. *k*, Mt. xiii. 27, zozania (zizania); Mk. xiii. 13, hoc (hic).

- o for u in *misereator*, IV. 6 : cf. *k*, Mk. viii. 38, *filios* (*filius*), etc. ;
Schuchardt, ii. 149 *sqq.*
- pa for au in *palam* (?), II. 4.
- r for b in *regnarunt* (?), VII. 3. The converse change of b into r is
found in *k*, Mt. xii. 14, *exiebunt* (*exierunt*).
- s for ex in *scalciati*, XI. 12 ; cf. Rönsch, *op. cit.* 469.
- s for n in *suscitabunt* (corrupt for *concelabunt* (?)), VII. 4.
- s for t in *abrumpens*, II. 3 : cf. *k*, Mk. ix. 1, *adstans* (*adstant*),
etc.
- t for n in *tunc*, I. 15 : cf. *k*, Mt. x. 11, *digitus* (*dignus*).
- t for s in *eminent*, IX. 2 : cf. *k*, Mt. ii. 4, *scribit* (*-is*), etc.
- u for e in *transferunt*, II. 4 ; *coguntur*, VII. 2 ; *ut*, VII. 7 ; *cres-*
cunt, *exegunt*, XII. 10 : cf. *k*, Mk. xii. 32, *ut* for
et, etc.
- u for o in *putavimus* (*potabimus*), VII. 8 : cf. *k*, Mk. ix. 22,
putes (*potes*) ; ix. 41, *putaverit* (*potaverit*). See
Rönsch, *op. cit.* p. 465 ; cf. Schuchardt, *op. cit.* ii.
91 *sqq.*
- v for b in *intravit* and *oravit*, IV. 1 ; *acervus*, VI. 5, X. 4 ; *putav-*
imus, VII. 8 ; *suscitavit*, VIII. 1 ; *vindicavitur*, IX. 7
(X. 2) ; *conturvavitur*, X. 5 ; *altavit*, X. 9 ; *provata*,
XII. 9 ; *exivit*, XII. 13 : cf. *k*, Mt. i. 21, *salvavit*
(*-abit*) ; xii. 42, *damnavit* (*-abit*), etc.
- z for di in *Zabulus*, X. 1 : cf. *k*, Mt. xiii. 39, *Ziabolus*. This
change is frequent in the Latin fathers : cf. Rönsch,
op. cit. p. 457.

Other noteworthy points of orthography are—
the prefixing of the aspirate : *heremo*, III. 11 : cf. *k*,
haestis (*estis*), Mt. viii. 26 ; see Rönsch, *op. cit.*
462–463. The insertion of n in *Monses* (III. 11,
note) : cf. *k*, Mt. vi. 19, *thensaurus* ; see Rönsch,
op. cit. 458–459. Of t in *Istrahel*, III. 8, X. 8 :
cf. *k*, Mt. xv. 31 ; see Rönsch, 460. The omis-
sion of one of two doubled letters in *tribum*, III. 6,
IV. 9 ; in *profetis*, IV. 11 : cf. *k*, where *fili* and
alii are usually written *fili* and *ali* ; also Mk.

ix. 50, *fatum* (*fatuum*), etc.; see Schuchardt, *op. cit.* ii. 464–466. The duplication of a vowel in *patruum*, IV. 8.

Another peculiarity of style consists in the use of irregular futures in *bo*, *stabilibis*, II. 2; *tradibit* (?), VIII. 2; *tremebit*, X. 4: cf. *k*, Mt. ii. 6, *prodibit*, etc. Cf. Rönsch, *op. cit.* 291.

(b) *Syntax*.—We shall here notice some peculiar usages and constructions. *Iste* is used frequently for *is* or *ille*. *Qui* = *et ego*, *et is*, or *et ii*, in I. 6, 14, III. 14, X. 2. Cf. *k*, Mk. ix. 10, where *it* = *et ille*.

Dominari is used as a passive, II. 3; *judicare* governs a dative, VI. 2; so also *misereor*, XI. 10.

But the greatest departures from classical usage are to be found in connection with the prepositions. Thus *cum* takes the acc., X. 3. For this usage elsewhere, see Rönsch, *Itala und Vulgata*, 409–410. *De* twice takes the acc., I. 9, V. 1, where it is used of the agent, being here perhaps a rendering of *διά* with the gen. In XI. 13 it takes the acc. also where it has its ordinary meaning. For this usage elsewhere, see Rönsch, *op. cit.* p. 410. In III. 10 it takes the dat. or ablat. (= *ἐπί* with dat.). In V. 4 it takes the ablative of instrument. *In* is used with the ablat. where it should be the acc., IX. 6, X. 5; and with the acc. where it should be the ablat., VI. 5. In VIII. 4 it takes the ablat. of the

agent. *Secus* occurs eight times as a preposition with the acc., I. 10, II. 2, 5, etc. *Sine* takes the acc., I. 10. For this usage elsewhere, see Rönsch, *op. cit.* p. 412.

As regards conjunctions, *nam* is always used in a non-natural meaning, *i.e.* as a rendering for *δέ*; for the instances, see p. xxxvii. *Enim* is used in same way, V. 5.

Finally, the ablative of the gerund is used for the present participle in I. 9, V. 5, XI. 17. For instances of this idiom, see Rönsch, *op. cit.* pp. 432–433.

But the above list is far from exhausting the peculiarities of the text. It is replete with Graecisms and Hebraisms. For a discussion of these the reader should consult sec. 6 and sec. 7.

(ii.) **Critical Worth.**—This Version is very literal. This will be apparent when we come to the next two sections, in which we shall find that our text, though Latin in diction, is occasionally Greek, and frequently Hebrew in idiom. This, of course, is due to the almost servile faithfulness of the Greek, no less than of the Latin, translation. At times, indeed, the translation is careless, very careless, but as a general rule it is extremely trustworthy. We shall now proceed to point out its defects under the following heads:—

(a) *Omissions*. — Similitudinem, in II. 9, after omnem through homoioteleuton. Filius before Naue in X. 11, 15; but this omission may have originated in the Greek, where ὁ τοῦ may have fallen out before *Navή*. Suffixes are occasionally omitted: see IV. 6, note; VII. 9, XII. 7. These may be due to the Greek translation. Others, such as those in I. 10, X. 10, 15, may be due to defects in the Hebrew copy used by the Greek translator.

(b) *Interpolations*.—I. 3–5 seem to have been originally marginal glosses from a Greek hand.

(c) *Dittographies*.—We have a most interesting case of this nature in V. 6, where six lines of the MS. are repeated twice. The slight differences existing between these duplicate renderings make it clear that we have here an attempt, on the part of the Latin translator, to improve on his first rendering. But the scribe of our MS. incorporated both. Other dittographies occur in VI. 3, XI. 13, and probably in VIII. 5.

(d) *Transpositions*.—In addition to transpositions of such as ut et for et ut in I. 8, and testatus et for et testans in IV. 12, etc., we have the transposition of the phrase cum infantibus nostris from the close of verse 5 to that of verse 4. A very complicated case of transposition occurs in X. 5. In I. 10 there is a transposition of the verb to the end of the clause such as we find not infrequently in

k: cf. Mt. vii. 10, 14, xv. 23, etc. But the most remarkable transposition of all is the removal of chaps. VIII.—IX. from their right position after V. to their present place. Similar transpositions are to be met with in the *Eth. Enoch* lviii.—lxxxii., xci.—xciii.

(*e*) *Corruptions*. — These are of very frequent occurrence. Many can be dealt with when we understand the character of the language and the confusions incidental to it. There are some cases of sheer blundering. But many of the present corruptions of the text are not native to it, but originated either in Greek Version or in the Hebrew. See sec. 6 and sec. 7.

(*f*) *Carelessness*.—We have instances of careless renderings in III. 11, 13 (see crit. notes, *in loc.*). The translator at times also renders the thought and not the word: cf. *colonia*, III. 2, V. 6, VI. 9, where Jerusalem is meant. This points to the fact that the Latin (or Greek?) translation was made after the destruction of Jerusalem, and its restoration by Hadrian as a Roman colony under the name *Aelia Capitolina*.

§ 6. THE LATIN VERSION—A TRANSLATION FROM THE GREEK

Of the derivation of our Latin text from the Greek there can be no question. Thus (1) *Greek words are*

transliterated, as *chedrio*, I. 17, from *κεδρώ*; *clibsis*, III. 7, from *θλίψις*; *heremus*, III. 11, from *ἐρήμος*; *acrobestia*, VIII. 3, from *ἀκροβυστία*.

(2) *Greek forms and idioms survive in the Latin*. Thus scene, I. 7 = *τῇ σκηνῇ*; and in *scenae*, I. 9 = *ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ*; and in IV. 2, *plebem hanc esse tibi plebem hanc exceptam*, the second *hanc* is the Greek article: thus the text = *τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον εἶναί σοι τὸν λαὸν τὸν ἐκλεκτόν*. For instances of this usage elsewhere, cf. Rönisch, *Italia u. Vulgata*, pp. 420–421. Finally, quia, V. 3 = *ὅτι* *recitantis*; and in *usque nos duci captivos*, III. 13, we have an imitation of the Greek, *ἕως τοῦ ἡμᾶς αἰχμαλωτισθῆναι*.

(3) *Not infrequently we must translate, not the Latin text, but the Greek which it presupposes, but which was misrendered by the Latin translator*. Thus *nam* must not be rendered by “for” in the following passages [I. 3], II. 4, 5, VIII. 2, 4, X. 11, XI. 8, XII. 11, 12, for in all these instances it is a rendering of *δέ* and must be translated accordingly. In like manner *enim*, V. 5 = *δέ*. Again, in VII. 7, we must render *ab oriente usque ad occidentem*, not “from east to west,” but “from sunrise to sunset,” i.e. *ἀφ’ ἡλίου ανατέλλοντος μέχρι δυομένου*. The Greek is susceptible of either meaning. Again, in XI. 11, we must translate, not *nec patiens ne unum quidem diem*, but the Greek which it presupposes: *οὐδὲ παριεῖς οὐδεμίαν ἡμέραν*, “not omitting a single

day." For other instances, see critical notes on XI. 12, 18, XII. 7.

(4) *Through retranslation into Greek the source of the incoherencies of the text can, in some cases, be discovered.* Thus finem in II. 7 = ὅρον, corrupt for ὅρκον; and adcedent = προσβήσονται, corrupt for παραβήσονται = "will transgress." It is possible that the Latin translator had παραβήσονται before him, and followed a meaning of it inappropriate to the context. Again, in III. 4, ducent se = ἀχθήσονται, corrupt for ἀχθέσονται; and in V. 6, in campo = ἐν ἄγρῳ, corrupt for ἐν ἀργύρῳ. In these passages I have corrected the Latin text accordingly. See the critical notes, *in loc.*

(5) *Fragments of the Greek Version are still preserved.* See the notes on p. 6; see also pp. 107-110.

§ 7. THE GREEK—A TRANSLATION FROM A HEBREW ORIGINAL

The derivation of our text from a Semitic original was stoutly denied by Hilgenfeld and others. Volkmar is doubtful (*Mose Prophetie*, pp. 56, 57). But this view can no longer be maintained. It is surprising, indeed, on what slender grounds it has been advanced. Thus Hilgenfeld (*Mess. Jud.*, p. lxxiii) urges the absence of the

pronoun in the accusative after *Deus creavit*, in XII. 4; of the pronominal suffix after *magistri* in V. 5, as reasons against a Semitic original. In my critical note on IV. 6, I have shown that Greek and Latin translators of Hebrew occasionally omitted the suffix in their translation. For instances in the LXX. and Vulgate, see the note referred to. Hilgenfeld's other arguments do not call for consideration. The difficulties he discovers, which make against a Semitic original, are mainly the offspring of his own imagination.

But although a Semitic original is now generally conceded, it is still a matter of debate whether the balance of evidence preponderates in favour of an Aramaic or of a Hebrew source. Schmidt-Merx, Colani, Hausrath, and Carriere decide for the former, and Rosenthal for the latter. Ewald apparently held both views at different times (*Göttinger gelehrte Anz.*, 1862, pp. 4-7; 1867, pp. 110-118). Schürer thinks a Semitic original probable, but not certain. Of the above scholars, it is only Schmidt-Merx, and in a minor degree Rosenthal, that have seriously treated the subject. In the *Archiv f. wissenschaftl. Erforschung des A.T.*, I. ii. 111-152, Schmidt-Merx show, in a variety of passages, how readily the text admits of re-translation into Aramaic; but this proof in itself is wholly inadequate, for the same passages can

just as easily be rendered into Hebrew. In two cases, however, they urge that, whereas the idiosyncrasies of the Latin text can be explained on the hypothesis of an Aramaic original, no such explanation is possible on the hypothesis of a Hebrew original. The first instance is to be found in I. 10, where, according to these editors, the order of the Latin text can only be accounted for by an Aramaic original. In my critical note on that verse, I have shown that it is possible to interpret the text in two ways. According to one of those, the present order of the text can be explained as derived from the Hebrew. But even, according to the other, it is not necessary to resort to the Aramaic hypothesis; for we cannot argue with certainty from our text as to the order of the original source. This is clear from I. 14, where, though the Greek and Latin Versions are preserved and agree verbally, they do not agree as to order. Hence the order in question is probably due to the carelessness of the translator. Moreover, other undoubted transpositions of the text do occur (cf. III. 4, 5, X. 5, crit. notes). That the Latin translator did not observe the order of the Greek before him, we see in numerous instances in the *Codex Bobbiensis*, *k*, see pp. xxxv—xxxvi. The second instance of alleged Aramaic order is that in III. 2. Here Schmidt-Merx point out that

the position of omnia in the phrase sancta vasa omnia is conformable to Aramaic, but not to Hebrew, syntax. This is quite true, but does not thereby justify the conclusion they seek to draw from it. For even in translations made *directly* from the Hebrew, and not as in the case of our text, which is derived from the Hebrew through the Greek, this same phenomenon recurs three times in the LXX. of Genesis, *i.e.* in xiv. 11, xxviii. 15, l. 14 (in several MSS.). See also Lev. xx. 23; 2 Chron. xxi. 18. Now if, in a careful translation made directly from the Hebrew, this non-Hebrew order can appear three times in one book, it shows that no value is to be attached to its single occurrence in a version that is not immediately from the Hebrew, but only mediately, and that is likewise often careless to boot. Our verdict therefore must be, that Schmidt-Merx have furnished no adequate grounds for their thesis that the Assumption is derived from an Aramaic, and not from a Hebrew original.

It is now time to advance the grounds for a Hebrew original. These have gradually discovered themselves in the course of a long and careful study of this book. Whether I shall be more successful in my contention than my predecessors must be left to the reader to decide. Rosenthal (*Vier apocryphische Bücher*, pp. 34–38) has already

preceded me in advocating this view. One or two of his restorations are good, and have been adopted in the sequel, with due recognition, but the bulk of his suggestions I cannot accept; they are frequently wild and quite beside the mark.

The grounds, then, for a Hebrew original are—

(1) *Hebrew idiomatic phrases survive in the text.* Thus in respectu quo respiciet, I. 18; tribus sanctitatis, II. 4; circumibo, II. 7; terram patriae suae, III. 3; homo de proximo suo; testans . . . invocabat testes, III. 12; de isto, III. 13; dividentur ad veritatem, V. 2; in sacerdotes vocabuntur and facient facientes, VI. 1; implebuntur manus, X. 2, are pure Hebraisms. The Hebrew equivalents will be found in the critical notes on the various passages. Now it is quite true that the majority of these could be paralleled by Aramaic expressions, but not all. Thus circumibo, II. 7 = “I will protect,” *i.e.* אסובב (cf. Deut. xxxii. 10), cannot be explained from the Aramaic; nor yet in sacerdotes vocabuntur, VI. 1 = יקראו על כהנים (cf. 1 Chron. xxiii. 14).

(2) *Syntactical idioms probably survive, e.g.* the circumstantial clause in VII. 9 and IX. 4. In VIII. 2, torquebit et tradidit, there may be an instance of perfect with the strong vav; also in VII. 2, 3, cogentur . . . et regnarunt.

(3) *In some cases we must translate, not the Latin*

text, but the Hebrew presupposed by it. Thus, successor = *διάδοχος* = מִשְׁרָת, must be rendered "minister," in I. 7; and non coepit = οὐκ ἤρξατο = לֹא הוּאִיל, must be rendered by "He was not pleased."

(4) *Frequently it is only through retranslation that we can understand the source of corruptions in the text, and remove them.* Thus, in IV. 9, the impossible text, *devenient apud nationes* (MS. *natos*) in *tempore tribuum* (MS. *writes tribum* for genitive, cf. III. 5) = יִרְדּוּ בְּנוֹיִם בַּעַת שְׁבָטִים. Here the two corruptions that destroy the sense of the context at once become apparent—יִרְדּוּ is corrupt for יִרְבּוּ, and שְׁבָטִים for יְטִבִּיתֶם. Thus the text is brought into harmony not only with itself, but also with similar statements in Josephus, 4 Ezra, and Philo. This restoration would be impossible on the assumption of an Aramaic original.

In V. 5, the equally impossible text, *qui enim magistri sunt doctores eorum* = (with Hilgenfeld) οἱ δὲ διδασκαλοὶ ὄντες, οἱ καθηγηταὶ αὐτῶν = וְהַרְבֵּי מוֹרִיָּהֶם. Now the context of these words is against any mention of the rabbis or teachers here. But we see that the Hebrew does not necessarily refer to them, but also means "the many." And this gives a most appropriate sense. In the preceding verse, "some" are false priests; in this verse, "many" are venal judges. Hence we see

that מוריהם is here merely a marginal but mistaken gloss that was later incorporated in the text.

In X. 4 (see crit. note, p. 86) we can restore sanity to the text through retranslation. In X. 10 we have a most interesting restoration. In the words said of Israel triumphant in heaven,—videbis inimicos tuos in terram,—we have an impossible statement. After the final judgment, Israel's enemies can no longer be on the earth. The context implies that they are in torment, and in torment in the sight of glorified Israel. Now these two facts suggest at once Gehenna, and that the original was בני הנם. But the הנם was somehow lost, and בני was partly rendered partly transliterated ἐν γῆ, and this in turn by in terram. נִי is frequently so transliterated (see notes, pp. 43, 44).

I shall only adduce one more passage. In XII. 7, temperantius misericordiae ipsius . . . contegerunt mihi, we have an inadmissible text. But the source of the corruption comes to light if we retranslate. Thus the words = ἐπιεικῶς συνέβη μοι ἔλεος αὐτοῦ = הוֹאִיל וקִרָא אוֹתִי חֶסֶדוֹ. Here we should read מ before חֶסֶדוֹ, and with this simple change we get an unexceptionable text: "He was pleased to call me in His compassion." See pp. 98, 99 for details. This restoration also is impossible on the Aramaic hypothesis.

(5) *A play upon words discovers itself on retransla-*

tion into Hebrew in VII. 3, where it is said of the Sadducees (צדוקים), dicentes se esse justos, *i.e.* צדיקים. This has already been pointed out by Geiger. It recurs in VII. 6 (see p. 27).

On the above grounds, I hold, therefore, that it is no longer possible to doubt the Semitic original of this book. It may reasonably also be concluded from what precedes, that that original was in Hebrew and not in Aramaic.

How far the character of classical Hebrew was preserved in the original it is impossible to say. My retranslations presuppose generally such a character, but the cogency of the restorations is not bound up with such a presupposition.

§ 8. THE PRESENT BOOK IN REALITY A TESTAMENT OF MOSES. THE ORIGINAL ASSUMPTION PRESERVED ONLY IN A FEW QUOTATIONS.

In the lists of apocryphal books we find mention of a Testament of Moses (*Διαθήκη Μωυσέως*) followed immediately by an Assumption of Moses¹ (*Ἀνάληψις Μωυσέως*). In the "List of Sixty Books," and in the Synopsis of Athanasius, the

¹ This book is so named in the *Acta Synodi Nicæn*, ii. 18, 20; the Stichometry of Nicephorus; and the Synopsis of Athanasius: as the *Adscensio Mosis* in Origen, *de Princip.* iii. 2. 1; as the *Assumptio Mosis* in Didymus Alex. (see p. 108 for quotation); as *Secreta Moysi* in Evodius (see p. 108).

number of stichoi in these two books is not given, but this desideratum is supplied by the Stichometry ascribed to Nicephorus, which assigns to them respectively 1100 and 1400 stichoi. In this connection an excellent suggestion has been made by Schürer to the following effect: "Seeing that the writing that has come down to us is in point of fact a 'Testament (will) of Moses,' though, as we have already seen, it is quoted in the Acts of the Council of Nicæa under the title *Ἀνάληψις Μωυσέως*, it may be assumed that both these designations were the titles of two separate divisions of one and the same work, the first of which has been preserved, whereas the quotations in the Fathers almost all belong to the second." My study of the Latin Version and the Greek fragments has led me to accept this suggestion in a modified form. The Testament and Assumption mentioned in the above lists are to be regarded not as "two separate divisions of one and the same work" with Schürer, but as two originally independent works subsequently put together and edited in one.

Before we adduce the grounds for this theory—owing to the scanty amount of materials these cannot be many—we must first show that Rönsch's identification of the above "Testament" with the Book of Jubilees (*Das Buch der Jubiläen*, pp. 480, 481) is contrary to existing evidence. We

have seen above that in the Stichometry of Nicephorus, 1100 stichoi are ascribed to this "Testament." Now, in the same list, 4300 are assigned to Genesis. Hence, if Rönsch's identification is right, Genesis should be nearly four times larger than the Book of Jubilees. But since, as a matter of fact, it is considerably smaller, it is needless to consider further this identification.

Having disposed of this objection, we now return to our thesis that the present Latin Version and the Greek fragments in the Fathers belong respectively to two originally independent works, which were subsequently edited together. This conclusion is probable from the following facts:—

(i.) The book quoted by St. Jude, by Clement of Alexandria, and later Greek writers, was wholly concerned with the Assumption of Moses and incidents connected with it. This we take to have been the original Assumption of Moses.

(ii.) The book preserved in the Latin Version is in reality a "Testament," and not an "Assumption of Moses." Indeed, it appears to be quite opposed to this claim made on Moses's behalf; for

(a) According to the Latin Version (*i.e.* the "Testament"), Moses was to die an ordinary death. Thus in I. 15, Moses says: "I am passing away to sleep with my fathers even

in the presence of all the people." In III. 13 the tribes speak of Moses's death. In X. 14 Moses again declares: "I shall go to sleep with my fathers." In X. 12 this was clearly the original sense. "From my death—assumption—until His advent there will be CCL. times." We shall touch presently on the explanation of the intruded word "assumption."

- (b) A description of the conclusion of the Testament appears to have been preserved in a Catena on the Pentateuch edited by Franc. Zephyrus, and quoted in Fabricius in his *Cod. Pseud. V. T.*, ii. pp. 121, 122. "Est quidem in Apocrypho Mysticoque codice legere, ubi de creatis rebus subtilius agitur, nubem lucidam, quo tempore mortuus est Moses, locum sepulchri complexam oculos circumstantium perstrinxisse ita, ut nullus neque morientem legislatorem neque locum videre potuerit, ubi cadaver conderetur." Here no Assumption seems to be implied, but only an extraordinary disappearance of Moses's body, such as is recorded in Deut. xxxiv. 5, 6. If this writer had been acquainted with the original Assumption, in which the details of Moses's ascension to heaven were re-

corded, he could not have written in these vague terms.

(iii.) The "Testament" and the "Assumption of Moses" were subsequently edited in one book. Of this editing we find a trace in X. 12: "From my death—assumption—until His advent," etc. Here the word "assumption" can best be explained as an insertion of the editor in order to adapt the text of the Testament to the main subject of the second work which he incorporates, *i.e.* the Assumption.

(iv.) In the thirteenth section of Vassiliev's *Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina*, entitled *Palaea historica*,—an O.T. history of events from Adam to Daniel,—of the portion which deals with the death of Moses, part seems to be ultimately derived from the "Testament," and part from the "Assumption" properly so called. *The following lines* (pp. 257–258) *would form a fitting close to the "Testament":*—

[Περὶ τῆς τελευτῆς Μωϋσέως.] καὶ εἶπεν Μωϋσῆς πρὸς Ἰησοῦν τοῦ Ναυί. Ἀνέλθωμεν ἐν τῷ ὄρει. καὶ ἀνελθόντων αὐτῶν εἶδεν Μωϋσῆς τὴν γῆν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν. Κάτελθε πρὸς τὸν λαόν, καὶ ἀνάγγειλον αὐτοῖς ὅτι Μωϋσῆς ἐτελεύτησεν. καὶ κατήλθεν Ἰησοῦς πρὸς τὸν λαόν, ὁ δὲ Μωϋσῆς τὰ τέλη τοῦ βίου ἐκτίσατο. Here Moses dismisses Joshua, and dies apparently an ordinary death. But according to the Assumption proper (see quotation from Clement Alex. p. 107),

both Joshua and Caleb were present when the assumption of Moses took place. The words that follow on the above in Vassiliev are based ultimately on the Assumption proper. καὶ ἐπειρᾶτο Σαμουὴλ ὡς ἂν καταβάσῃ τὸ σκύνωμα (= σκήνωμα) αὐτοῦ τῷ λάφῃ ἵνα θεοποιηθῶσιν αὐτόν. Μιχαὴλ δὲ ὁ ἀρχιστράτηγος προστάξει Θεοῦ ἦλθεν λαβεῖν αὐτὸν καὶ συνστεῖλαι καὶ ἀνθίστατο αὐτῷ Σαμουὴλ, καὶ διεμάχοντο. ἀγανακτήσας οὖν ὁ ἀρχιστράτηγος ἐπετίμησεν αὐτὸν εἰπών· Ἐπιτιμᾶ σε κύριος, διάβολε. καὶ οὕτως ἡττήθη ὁ ἀντικείμενος καὶ φυγὴν ἐχρήσατο· ὁ δὲ ἀρχάγγελος Μιχαὴλ συνέστειλεν τὸ σκύνωμα Μωϋσῇ ὅπου προσετάχθη παρὰ Θεοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡμῶν.

(v.) This editing of the two books in one was probably done in the first century, as St. Jude draws upon both in his Epistle (see p. lxii). The statement of Josephus (*Ant.* iv. 8. 48) is interesting: “ νέφους αἰφνίδιον ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ στάντος, ἀφανίζεται κατὰ τινος φάραγγος. Γέγραφε δὲ αὐτὸν ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς βίβλοις τεθνεῶτα, δείσας μὴ δι’ ὑπερβολὴν τῆς περὶ αὐτὸν ἀρετῆς πρὸς τὸ θεῖον αὐτὸν ἀναχωρῆσαι τολμήσωσιν εἰπεῖν.” It holds fast to Deut. xxxiv. 5, 6 and the account in the Testament, but shows that the writer is aware of the new claims made on Moses’s behalf in the Assumption. Does the account of the Transfiguration point in any respect to popular belief in Moses’s Assumption?

§ 9. DISLOCATION OF CHAPTERS VIII.—IX. IN THE
LATIN TEXT FROM THEIR ORIGINAL POSITION
AFTER CHAPTER V.

The interpretation of these two chapters will remain an impossibility so long as scholars attempt to deal with them in their present position. I have given, in the notes on pp. 28–30, the grounds which necessitate this new departure in the exegesis of the book.

§ 10. THE AUTHOR A PHARISAIC QUIETIST

There is some difficulty in determining the religious party in Judaism to which the author belonged. First of all, however, it is clear that he was not a Sadducee; for (1) he looks forward to the direct intervention of God on behalf of Israel, and the establishment of a theocratic kingdom on earth (X. 3–8). (2) He dwells on the future blessedness of the righteous (X. 10, 11). (3) He attacks the Sadducean party in the most bitter terms (VII.).

Secondly. He was not a Zealot. This view has been advocated by Wieseler, Dillmann, Schürer, and others. But it is just as impossible as that which precedes; for (1) the writer's complete silence as to the Maccabean rising forms an emphatic censure

of their appeal to arms. This silence is all the more impressive as the writer was thoroughly acquainted with the Maccabean movement. Thus his text shows an intimate acquaintance with Books I. and II. of the Maccabees, or, at all events, with the facts on which these are based; and the reader will fail to appreciate the allusions and nuances of the narrative unless he brings to its perusal an accurate and detailed knowledge of Maccabean history. We have here, in fact, to deal with the work, not of a popular enthusiast, but of an accurate scholar. (2) And, whilst he thus shows his aversion to the aims and method of the Maccabees,—in other words, to a militant Judaism,—he is careful to indicate his own admirations. He will not trust in an arm of flesh. Thus his hero (IX.) is not one who takes up arms on behalf of Israel, but one who, amid the most bitter persecution that ever befel Israel, was faithful unto death, and, lifting no hand in self-defence, committed his cause unto God. See notes on pp. 32–38. (3) The aim of such a description as appears in IX. is to indicate the line of action which the Pharisaic party should pursue, *i.e.* one of non-resistance. The writer protests against the growing corruption of the Pharisaic party by political aims and methods. See notes on pp. 34, 35. (4) X. 3–10 is wholly against the idea of a Zealot author. This passage, in fact, confirms all that has

been said above. The theocratic or Messianic kingdom is to be introduced not by the militant acts of the saints, but through the direct intervention of God.

Thirdly. He was not an Essene, as Schmidt-Merx have supposed. (1) The entire book is interpenetrated with national hopes and aspirations. See especially X. 8. The ideal of the Essene was individualistic and ethical, and not national. (2) The greatest interest is taken in all the fortunes of the temple. Thus it was built by God (II. 4), its frequent profanations are dwelt upon (II. 8, 9, V. 3, 4, VI. 1), and its complete destruction by Nebuchadnezzar (III. 2) and its partial destruction by Varus (VI. 9). Such an interest could not be natural in an Essene, who was excluded from its courts (Joseph. *Ant.* xviii. 1. 5). (3) The pure or polluted character of the sacrifices in the temple is carefully recorded. Thus it is said that they are (rightly) offered during a long period of history (II. 6). At a later period they are said to be imperfect (IV. 8). It is observed in II. 8 that sacrifices were offered to idols, and in V. 4 that, though offered to God, they were polluted. Now such a concern in the sacrifices of the temple is likewise unnatural in an Essene, who disapproved wholly of animal sacrifice (Philo, ii. 457, οὐ ζῶα καταθύοντες), and esteemed their sacrificial meals as far transcending any

temple sacrifice in worth (*Ant.* xviii. 1. 5). (4) According to our author, the future abode of the blessed is the heaven of the stars (X. 9), but the Essene heaven was beyond the ocean (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 11). Again, Gehenna is the place of punishment for Israel's national foes (X. 10). We know of no such conception among the Essenes. (5) The fact that pre-existence is ascribed to Moses *as a special distinction* (I. 14) implies a disbelief in the Essene doctrine of the pre-existence of all souls (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 11).

As we have now shown that our author was neither a Sadducee, a Zealot, nor an Essene, there remains no further difficulty in determining the religious party to which he belonged. He was clearly a Pharisaic Quietist. This is shown by the facts which we have enumerated above in the refutation of the preceding views. He was a Pharisee of a fast-disappearing type, recalling in all respects the Chasid of the early Maccabean times, and upholding the old traditions of quietude and resignation. While his party was fast committing itself to political interests and movements, he raised his voice to recall them from the evil ways on which they had entered, and besought them to return to the old paths, but his appeal was made in vain, and so the secularisation of the Pharisaic movement in due course culminated in the fall of Jerusalem.

§ 11. THE DATE

It is impossible to deal seriously with the late date assigned to this book by Volkmar and Colani, 137–138 A.D. Their only ground for so doing is to be found in the historical character of chaps. VIII., IX., which, they allege, is a veiled narrative of the persecution under Hadrian. The reader will see that, like these writers, I too have accepted the historicity of these chapters, and shown, by a minute investigation of every phrase, that they recount, not the calamities of the Jews under Hadrian, but under Antiochus Epiphanes. See notes on pp. 28–38. If this has been proved satisfactorily, as I hold it to be, then it is no longer possible to advocate a second-century date. But even should the proof be deemed inadequate, insuperable difficulties still confront the upholders of such a view. For, from internal evidence, it appears that the book must have been written before 70 A.D. This we shall now proceed to show.

The book was written before 70 A.D. For (1) the temple is to stand till the establishment of the theocratic kingdom (I. 17). See note on p. 7. (2) The temple was still standing when the book was written. This is to be inferred from the consideration that if it had fallen, such an event could not have been passed over in silence. It could not have

been passed over ; for all the fortunes of the temple, even its temporary profanations by a faithless priesthood, are carefully recorded. See II. 4, 8, 9, III. 2, V. 3, 4, VI. 1, 9, VIII. 5. When the temple did fall, it left an ineffaceable mark on all subsequent Jewish literature, but particularly in that of the next sixty years: cf. the later portions of the Apoc. Bar. and 4 Ezra. The views, therefore, of Volkmar, Colani, Keim, Hausrath, and Rosenthal, who date the composition of the Assumption after 70, are untenable.

Now, all other scholars are agreed as to its composition before 70 A.D., but differ with each other as to the exact period to which it should be assigned between 4 B.C. and 70 A.D. Many of these differences¹ are due to the purely arbitrary restorations of the unintelligible fragments of numbers in VII. 2, and may therefore be at once discounted.

So far we have determined only the latest limit of composition, *i.e.* 70 A.D. There is no difficulty as to its earliest. This is 3 B.C.; for Herod is already dead (VI. 6), and the war of Varus already past (VI. 9). After this war, the writer declares, the times will be ended, and "the four hours will come" (VIII. 1). Thus the limits of composition lie between 3 B.C. and 70 A.D. But there are data

¹ Thus Hilgenfeld assigns the book to the years 44-45 A.D.; Schmidt-Merx to 54-64; Fritzsche to 50-60.

for a nearer determination. In VI. 7 the statement, "And he (Herod) will beget children, who, succeeding him, will rule for shorter periods," was true of Archelaus alone; for Philip and Antipas reigned longer than their father. Hence the book must have been written before these princes had reigned for thirty-four years, *i.e.* before 30 A.D.¹ Thus the date of composition lies between 3 B.C. and 30 A.D. But the limits may be defined still more closely. For the prediction, that Herod's sons should rule for shorter periods than their father, may be reasonably explained from two considerations: (*a*) from the general expectation that the sons of such a wicked king could not long preserve their authority; but still more (*b*) from the actual deposition of Archelaus after a short reign of ten years 4 B.C.—6 A.D.,—an event which would naturally be construed by our author in the light of a divine judgment, and suggest to him the prediction which appears in the text as to the impending fate of Philip and Antipas. Hence, however, we may interpret the "four hours" in VII. 1; it may be fairly concluded that part of these

¹ Ewald, Wieseler, Drummond, Dillmann, and Schürer refer the composition of the book to the first decade after 4 B.C. This conclusion they arrive at by pressing the words "the times will be ended" in VII. 1. For the way in which Reuss, followed by Baldensperger and Rosenthal, seeks to evade the conclusions that naturally follow from VI. 7, see the note on that verse (p. 22).

have already elapsed when the author writes, and that the earliest limit of composition is 7 A.D. Thus the book was composed between the years 7-30 A.D.

§ 12. VIEWS OF THE AUTHOR ON MOSES, ISRAEL
THE MESSIANIC KINGDOM, GOOD WORKS

Moses.—Moses was prepared, from before the foundation of the world, to be the mediator of God's covenant with His people (I. 14, III. 12). During his life he was Israel's intercessor with God (XI. 11, 17); for forty years he suffered many things at their hands in Egypt, the Red Sea, and the wilderness (III. 11). When about to die, he chose Joshua in his stead (X. 15), apparently as the prophet promised in Deut. xviii. 15. His death was an ordinary one (I. 15, III. 13, X. 12, 14); but no single place was worthy to mark the place of his burial, for his sepulchre was from the rising to the setting sun, and from the south to the confines of the north—yea the entire world was his sepulchre (XI. 8). But his relation to Israel did not cease with death; he was appointed by God to be their intercessor in the spiritual world (XII. 6).

Israel.—Israel is God's own people (I. 12): the world was created in their behalf (I. 12): and Moses

prepared, from before the foundation of the world, to establish the covenant relation between God and His people (I. 14), and Jerusalem prepared, in like manner, to be the centre of the worship of Jehovah till the establishment of the theocratic kingdom (I. 17). Israel's history is then shortly summarised from the time of the Exodus to the split between the two kingdoms. From this time the writer carefully distinguishes between the two tribes and the ten. The former constitute the two "holy tribes" (II. 4), yet the solidarity of the twelve tribes is never lost sight of; for Judah's captivity is attributed to the sins of Israel (III. 5). In due time the two tribes return from their captivity, but grieve over their imperfect sacrifices (IV. 8)—imperfect, apparently, because the ten tribes are not with them, though they are increasing and multiplying in the land of their captivity (IV. 9). But the history of restored Judah becomes an evil one, namely, owing to the Sadducean priesthood (V.), but a righteous kernel still survived who were faithful to the law (IX. 4). Then ensues the persecution of Antiochus (VIII.), and the withdrawal of the Chasid party from political alliances (IX.). The Maccabean king-priests are alluded to, and their successor Herod (VI.). With his death, and probably the deposition of Archelaus, we arrive at the writer's own period. Herewith we pass from the region of

history to that of prediction. The theocratic or Messianic kingdom will be ushered in by a day of repentance (I. 17). 1750 years after the death of Moses,¹ *i.e.* between 75 and 107 A.D. (?), God will intervene on behalf of Israel,—of Israel, be it observed, not of Judah and Benjamin alone (X. 8). Here, again, the solidarity of the nation, in the writer's mind, discovers itself. As they suffered vicariously for each other's sins (III. 5), so likewise the promises were made to the twelve tribes collectively (III. 9), and they should all be glorified together (X. 8). Thus when the theocratic kingdom was established the ten tribes were to be restored. During this kingdom Israel's national enemies were to be destroyed (X. 8). Finally, Israel was to be exalted to heaven (X. 9), whence they should see their enemies in Gehenna (X. 10).

The Messianic or Theocratic Kingdom.—In the preceding paragraph we have given the various

¹ This seems to be the period meant by the *250 times* spoken of in X. 12 (see note). As we have no means of determining the length of the interval between the death of Moses and the Christian era, according to our author, we cannot determine the date of the expected advent of God, which was to take place 1750 years after Moses's death. If we may accept Josephus's chronology for this period, then the date of the Divine Advent was to be in the year 75 or 88 or 107, according as we regard 1675 years (*Ant.* xx. 10. 2) as having elapsed between Moses's death and the Christian era, or 1662 years (*Ant.* x. 9. 7; xi. 1. 1; *Bell. Jud.* vi. 4. 8; 10. 1), or 1643 years (*Bell. Jud.* vi. 4. 8). (See Herzog's *R.E.* xvii. p. 460.)

references to this kingdom which are found in our author. There is no Messiah. Indeed, in X. 7, the author seems to be really inimical to this expectation: "The Eternal God alone . . . will punish the Gentiles" (see note, *in loc.*). This may be due to the fact that the conception of the Messiah, as a man of war, was gaining more and more acceptance amongst the Pharisees, and was thus of a nature to promote the growing secularisation of Pharisaism. Now, it is against the latter evil that the author's writing is directed.

Good Works.—On the doctrine of merit, or good works, our author's views are allied to O.T. conceptions, rather than to the rabbinic doctrine of man's righteousness, which bulks so largely in Jewish literature from 50 A.D. onwards. See my edition of the Apocalypse of Baruch xiv. 7, xxi. 9, notes. So far from representing man's righteousness as involving merit over against God,—an undoubted Pharisaic doctrine of the first century of our era,—our author represents even the greatest hero of Judaism as declaring: "Not for any virtue or strength of mine, but in His compassion and long-suffering, was He pleased to call me" (XII. 7). Similarly Moses declares to Joshua: "It is not on account of the godliness of this people (Israel) that thou shalt root out the nations" (XII. 8).

§ 13. NEW TESTAMENT AND LATER WRITERS
ACQUAINTED WITH THE ASSUMPTION

St. Jude unquestionably was acquainted both with the Testament of Moses and with the Assumption, properly so-called, which together compose the complete book.

Thus St. Jude 9 is derived from the latter: see p. 107. From this indubitable case of borrowing we proceed to deal with another, for which the evidence is very strong. St. Jude 16 is composed of several clauses which agree verbally or in substance with V. 5, VII. 7, 9 of our Latin text—the original Testament of Moses. We shall here give the Greek text of Jude, inserting after each clause its parallel from our text. *Οὗτοί εἰσι γογγυσταί, μεμφίμοιροι* (Ass. Moys. VII. 7, quaerulosi), *κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι καὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα* (VII. 9, et manus eorum et mentes immunda tractantes, et os eorum loquetur ingentia), *θαυμάζοντες πρόσωπα, ὠφελείας χάριν* (V. 5, mirantes personas locupletum et accipientes munera). In St. Jude 18 the “mockers” (*ἐμπαίκται*) appear to be the homines pestilentiosi (VII. 3) (see note, *in loc.*). The “ungodly men” who are mentioned in St. Jude 4 appear twice in chap. VII. 3, 7 (impii). Now, lest the full force of these parallels should escape us, we should observe

that the accounts in both books are actually or nominally prophetic. The classes of evil-doers dealt with are those who shall be "in the last time," according to Jude 18, and "when the times are ended," in our text.

The writer of 2 Peter also appears to have used our text. Thus II. 10, 11 are based on Jude 9, or both are equally dependent on the original Assumption. Some passages support the latter alternative. Thus with 2 Peter ii. 13, *ἡδονὴν ἡγούμενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφῇ*, compare Ass. Moysi, VII. 5, *omni hora diei amantes convivia*; and with *ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀγαπαῖς αὐτῶν συνευχόμενοι* (*Vulg.*, *affluentes, in conviviis suis luxuriantes vobiscum*), compare VII. 8, *Habebimus discubitiones et luxuriam*. Compare also 2 Peter ii. 3 with VII. 6.

There are some remarkable parallels between St. Stephen's speech in Acts vii. and our text. The most remarkable is that in III. 11, "Who suffered many things in Egypt, and in the Red Sea, and in the wilderness during forty years," which agrees verbally for the most part with Acts vii. 36, *ποιήσας τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα ἐν τῇ Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ ἐν Ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσῃ, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἔτη τεσσαράκοντα*. The likeness is too close to be accidental. We must either assume that Acts vii. 36 is derived from our text, or that III. 11 *b* of our text is

interpolated. The evidence of Apoc. Bar. lxxxiv. 3 is against the latter supposition: likewise also the word "suffered."¹ Again, in III. 2, in the words, "that we should not transgress (God's) commandments in the which he was a mediator to us," the fact that they did transgress them is implied, and the fact that Moses was the mediator through whom they came, is expressly stated. Now, these two facts are distinctly given in Acts vii. 38, 39: "This is he that was . . . with the angel which spake to him on the Mount Sinai . . . who received living oracles to give unto us; to whom our fathers would not be obedient." Finally, there is the prediction of the captivity in III. 13, and the citation of the prophecy of Amos to that effect in VII. 43.

Again, Matt. xxiv. 29 (cf. Mark xiii. 24-25; Luke xxi. 25-26) is either dependent on X. 5 of our text, or else both are derived from a common source. This is clear if we compare Matt. xxiv. 29: ὁ ἥλιος σκοτισθήσεται καὶ ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τὸ φέγγος αὐτῆς, καὶ οἱ ἀστέρες . . . τῶν οὐρανῶν σαλευθήσονται, with X. 5—

¹ This idea of Moses's suffering in connection with Israel is found in the *Jalkut* (translated by Heidenheim, *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift* (1871), p. 217). Moses . . . sagte: "Herr der Welt, offenbar und bekannt ist dir meine Mühe und mein Leiden, das ich mit ihnen (den Israeliten) zu erleiden hatte, bis ich ihnen die Lehre . . . eingeprägt hatte."

(Sol) in tenebras convertet se,
Et luna non dabit lumen. . . .
Et orbis stellarum conturbabitur.

It is noteworthy that in the parallel passage in Luke xxi. 25 there is a reference to the sea also, as there is in X. 6 of our text.

For another close parallel of our text, VIII. 1 with Matt. xxiv. 21, see notes on pp. 80, 81.

On the above grounds we conclude that this book was known to the writers of the Epistle of Jude and of Acts vii., and most probably to the writers of 2 Peter and Matt. xxiv. 29 (Mark xxii. 24-25; Luke xxi. 25-26).

It was known also to the writer of Apoc. Bar. lxxxiv. 2-5: see notes *in loc.* (pp. 12, 13). For the citations in Clement of Alexandria, Origen, etc., see pp. 107-110.

ASSUMPTION OF MOSES

ASSUMPTION OF MOSES



TRANSLATED FROM THE LATIN

I. (And it came to pass in the one hundred and twentieth year of the life of Moses), 2. That is,

I. 1. See crit. note.

2. *Two thousand five hundredth year.* This date of Moses' death is of great importance in Jewish chronology. If we compare it with the various dates assigned to this event in the Massoretic text, the Samaritan, the Book of Jubilees, and Josephus, we shall find that no two of these authorities agree. Thus the death of Moses is variously dated according to—

	Anno Mundi.
Assumption of Moses . . .	2500
Book of Jubilees	2450
Josephus, <i>Ant.</i> viii. 3. 1 . . .	2550
" or viii. 3. 1 combined with xx. 10 . . .	2530
Samaritan Pentateuch	3309
LXX.	3859
From these variations among authorities before and after the Christian era, it appears	

that the Massoretic chronology, which sets it down to 2706, either did not exist at the beginning of the Christian era, or else was only one of the many systems competing for popular acceptance. I shall return to this question in my Commentary on the Book of Jubilees, where the subject necessarily demands to be treated at some length. I shall, however, add here another fact which shows that the Massoretic chronology was wholly wanting in traditional authority as late as 50-100 A.D.—a circumstance that is incompatible with its assumed ancient origin. Thus according to Exod. xii. 40 (Mass. text), Israel is said to have sojourned 430 years in Egypt alone; whereas, in the Samaritan, this period embraces also the sojourn of the patriarchs in Canaan before their

the two thousand five hundredth year from the creation of the world, 6. That he called to him Joshua the son of Nun, a man approved of the Lord, 7. That he might be the minister of the people and of the tabernacle of the testimony with all its

descent into Egypt. Here the Samaritan is supported by the LXX., and substantially also by the Pharisaic Book of Jubilees. This reckoning, further, is followed by St. Paul, Gal. iii. 17, and Josephus, *Ant.* ii. 15. 2. It reappears also at a later date in the Targum of Jonathan on Exod. xii. 40. Some writers have cited as testimonies to the Massoretic reckoning Philo, *Quis rer. div.* § 54 (i. 511); Josephus, *Ant.* i. 10. 3; *Bell. Jud.* v. 9. 4; Acts vii. 6: but all these passages are either directly drawn from or based upon Gen. xv. 13, where 400 years are spoken of, except that in *Bell. Jud.* v. 9. 4, where the context is indecisive either way.

3. The MS. inserts here: "But according to the reckoning of the East . . . of the departure of the Phoenix." This verse was interpolated by the Greek translator in the West. It may originally have been a Greek marginal gloss. See crit. note (p. 54).

4. The MS. inserts here: "When the people went forth after the exodus which was made by Moses to Amman across the Jordan." See crit. note. The Amman here mentioned appears, as Rönsch (*Z.f. W. T.* 1884, pp. 555, 556) points out, to be a town in the tribe of Gad. See

Onom. Sacr., ed. Lag., 88, 31: Amman quae nunc Filadelfia, urbs Arabiae nobilis, in qua habitaverunt olim Rafaim, gens antiqua; and 92, 2: Ammon trans Jordanem in tribu Gad. Haec est Amman de qua supra diximus, Filadelfi, civitas illustris Arabiae.

5. The MS. inserts: "In the prophecy which was made by Moses in the book Deuteronomy." See crit. note.

6. Called to him Joshua the son of Nun. These words are drawn from Deut. xxxi. 7.

Approved of the Lord. For phrase cf. Acts ii. 22; 2 Tim. ii. 15.

7. Minister of the people. See critical note on this verse (p. 56).

Tabernacle of the testimony. This is the *σκήνη τοῦ μαρτυρίου*, i.e. *אהל העדות*, as would appear from the words following: "with all its holy things." These holy things were the ark and the tables of testimony. Only for the addition of this clause the Hebrew might have been *אהל מועד* = "tent of meeting," where God spoke to Moses, Exod. xxxiii. 7-11, etc., and to Moses and Joshua in Deut. xxxi. 14-23. These two differing names of the tabernacle were derived from the two different purposes which it served.

holy things, 8. And that he might bring the people into the land given to their fathers, 9. That it should be given to them according to the covenant and the oath, which he spake in the tabernacle to give (it) by Joshua: saying to Joshua these words: 10. "(Be strong) and of a good courage according to thy might so as to do what has been commanded that thou mayst be blameless unto God." 11. So saith the Lord of the world. 12. For He hath

8. *And that he might bring the people, etc.* Deut. xxxi. 7; cf. also xxxi. 21.

9. *The covenant and the oath.* This is a favourite expression of the writer, cf. III. 9, XI. 17, XII. 13. We must restore it also in II. 7. See crit. note in *loc.* (pp. 62, 63).

Which He spake in the tabernacle, i.e. in Deut. xxxi. 14, 20, 23.

Saying to Joshua. These words are to be connected immediately with ver. 6: "He called to him Joshua . . . saying to Joshua." The intervening words are of the nature of a parenthesis.

10. *(Be strong) and of a good courage.* See crit. note (pp. 56, 57). These words go back immediately to Deut. xxxi. 7, from which also part of ver. 6 is derived.

Blameless unto God. See crit. note (pp. 57, 58). For the phrase cf. Deut. xviii. 13; 2 Sam. xxii. 24.

11. *So saith the Lord.* Moses here declares God to be the speaker of the words "Be strong," etc. In Josh. i. 7; Deut. xxxi. 23, they are addressed directly

to Joshua by God, but in Deut. xxxi. 6, 7 it is Moses that first uses them.

12. *Created the world on behalf of His people.* This is the prevalent view of Judaism from the first century of the Christian era onwards. Cf. 4 Ezra vi. 55, 59, vii. 11, and my note on Apoc. Bar. xiv. 18.

A still more limited view, *i.e.* that the world was created on behalf of the righteous in Israel, is expressed in Apoc. Bar. xiv. 19, xv. 7, xxi. 24. This conception reappears in the Shepherd of Hermas in a form adapted to its Christian environment. There it is the Christian Church to which the world owes its creation: *Vis. ii. 4. 1, διὰ ταυτὴν (= τὴν ἐκκλησίαν) ὁ κόσμος κατηρτίσθη.* Cf. also *Vis. i. 1. 6, iv., v.* The larger view, that the world was created on account of mankind, is found in Apoc. Bar. xiv. 18; 4 Ezra viii. 1, 44; Hermas Pastor, *Mand. xii. 4, ἐκτίσε τὸν κόσμον ἕνεκα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, and is the prevalent one in post-apostolic writers. Cf. Justin Mart. *Apol.*

created the world on behalf of His people. 13. But He was not pleased to manifest this purpose of creation from the foundation of the world, in order that the Gentiles might thereby be convicted, yea to their own humiliation might by (their) arguments convict one another. 14. Accordingly He designed

i. 10, ii. 4, 5; *Dial. c. Tryph.* 41; Irenaeus, v. 29. 1; Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* i. 13; Origen, *Contra Cels.* iv. 23.

13. *Was not pleased.* (See crit. note, p. 58.) The sense of the verse appears to be: God was unwilling to reveal the fact that the world was created on behalf of Israel in order that the Gentiles might be put to a common shame in their reasonings on this subject. What man could not discover (*Eccles.* iii. 11, viii. 17), God revealed through Moses (*ver.* 14).

14. This verse is quoted by Gelasius of Cyzicum in his *Comment. Act. Syn. Nic.* ii. 18 (*Fabric. Cod. Pseud. V.T.* i. 845; *Mansi, Concil.* ii. p. 844): μέλλων ὁ προφήτης Μωσῆς ἐξίεναι τοῦ βίου, ὡς γέγραπται ἐν βίβλῳ Ἀναλήψεως Μωυσέως, προσκαλεσάμενος Ἰησοῦν υἱὸν Ναυῆ καὶ διαλεγόμενος πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐφη· καὶ προεθεάσατό με ὁ Θεὸς πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου εἶναι με τῆς διαθήκης αὐτοῦ μεσίτην.

Prepared me before the foundation of the world. Pre-existence is here ascribed to Moses, as it was also to the Son of Man in *Eth. En.* xliiii. 2 (where see note). But about the beginning of the Christian era such pre-existence came to be regarded in

Alexandrian Judaism — not as the prerogative of one or more favoured souls, but as the common characteristic of all souls. See *Slav. En.* xxiii. 5. This was the prevailing doctrine of later Judaism.

From the foundation of the world. See crit. note on I. 14 (pp. 58, 59).

Mediator. The word μεσίτης, of which arbiter is clearly a translation, is found only in later Greek (Polybius, Lucian, and once only in the LXX., *Job* ix. 33. This designation of Moses as a mediator does not occur in the O.T. or in the Apocrypha, though his mediatorial functions appear clearly in *Deut.* v. 2, 5; *Exod.* xx. 19. It was, however, a recognised title of his in the first century of the Christian era. This is clear — (1) From the present work, I. 14, III. 12. (2) From the N.T. *Gal.* iii. 18, 19, where Moses is said to be the mediator through whom came the law ὁ νόμος . . . διαταγείς . . . ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου. Again in *Heb.* viii. 6, ix. 15, xii. 24 there is an obvious allusion to this designation of Moses, where over against the O.T. legislator, Christ is described as a "Mediator of a new (or 'better') covenant." (3) From

and devised me, and He prepared me before the foundation of the world, that I should be the mediator of His covenant. 15. And now I declare unto thee that the time of the years of my life is fulfilled and I am passing away to sleep with my fathers even in the presence of all the people. 16. And receive thou this writing that thou mayst know how to preserve the books which I shall deliver unto thee: 17. And thou shalt set these in order and anoint them with oil of cedar and put them away in earthen vessels in the place which He made from the beginning of the creation of the

Philo, *Vit. Moys.* iii. 19: *οὐα μεσίτης καὶ διαλλάκτης*. (4) From the Talmud, where Moses is frequently spoken of as a mediator, *i.e.* as מְסִיחָא; see Levy, *Neuhebr. und Chald. Lex.* iii. 595, 596. See also Shem. rab. on Exod. iii. 13; Bamid. rab. xi. 3. See Schöttgen, *Hor.* pp. 738, 739; Wetstein, *N.T.* ii. p. 224.

15. *Sleep with my fathers.* Cf. III. 13; X. 12, 14; Deut. xxxi. 16. Moses makes no reference here to his Assumption. The words, "Even in the presence of all the people," if they are the true text, refer clearly to his bodily decease. These words disagree both with the account in Deut. xxxiv. 5, 6, according to which no man witnessed his death, and with the Greek fragments of the Assumption (see pp. 107-110), according to which Joshua and Caleb were witnesses, but none other. With this verse compare

Apoc. Bar. xliv. 2: "Behold I go unto my fathers according to the way of all the earth."

16. *This writing.* Cf. X. 11, XI. 1.

17. *Anoint them with oil of cedar.* The sacred heavenly books shown to Enoch (Slav. En. xxii. 12) are described as "fragrant with myrrh."

From the beginning of the creation of the world. See crit. note on I. 14 (p. 58, 59).

In the place, etc., i.e. Jerusalem. In Joma 54b, Sifre 76b, the world is said to have been created with Zion as a starting-point. See Weber, pp. 199, 63-65 (2nd ed.). In Ezek. xxxviii. 12, v. 5, Zion is said to be the centre of the earth: cf. Eth. En. xxvi. 1, xc. 26; Jubilees viii. Is there any reference here to "stone of foundation," אבן שֹׁהַם, mentioned in the Targ. Jon. on Exod. xxviii. 30?

world, 18. That His name should be called upon until the day of repentance in the visitation where-with the Lord shall visit them in the consummation of the end of the days.

II. (And now) they will go by means of thee into the land which He determined and promised

18. *Until the day of repentance.*

The temple was thus expected to stand till the establishment of the theocratic kingdom. As Hilgenfeld remarks, no Jew could have so written after the destruction of the temple in 70 A.D. Still more impossible is the later date of Volkmar and Colani, which assigns this book to a time when Jerusalem was rebuilt as a Roman colony with a heathen temple and sacrifices, and no Jew was permitted to approach it. Cf. Justin, *Apol.* i. 47; Tert. *Adv. Jud.* 13; Schürer, *Div. I.* vol. ii. 294, 306-308, 315 sqq. (Eng. trans.).

The day of repentance. Taken in connection with the following words, this phrase refers to the great national repentance that was to precede the establishment of the Messianic or, as here, the theocratic kingdom. This national repentance was a precondition of the coming of the kingdom. "If Israel practises repentance, it will be redeemed; if not, it will not be redeemed," *Sanh.* 97b. This repentance was called also the great repentance. "Israel will not fulfil the great repentance before Elijah comes," *Pirke de R. Eliezer*, xliii. According to *Mal.* iv. 6 and *Luke* i. 16, 17,

this moral reformation was to be wrought by Elijah. So strongly were the Rabbins impressed with the value of this repentance, that in *Pesikta* 163b it is said: "If all Israel together repented for a single day, redemption through the Messiah would follow" (see Weber, 333, 334, 338, 1st ed.; 348, 353, 2nd ed.).

In the visitation, etc. The visitation here spoken of is one of mercy in relation to Israel. The word visit (*ἐπισκέπτεσθαι* = פקד) has generally in the O.T., and always in the N.T., a good sense. In the *Apoc. Bar.* and 4 *Ezra* it is almost always used in a bad sense of the penal visitation of God (see my note on *Apoc. Bar.* xx. 1). "The time of visitation" (*καὶρος ἐπισκοπῆς*, *Wisd.* iii. 7) is the establishment of the kingdom; cf. *Luke* xix. 44.

Them. Israel.

In the consummation of the end of days. Similarly in the *Apoc. Bar.* xxvii. 15, xxix. 8, the Messianic time is denoted by the phrase "the consummation of the times." The same phrase is used also of the last judgment; see *Apoc. Bar.* xxx. 3.

II. 1. Cf. *Deut.* xxxi. 7, 21-23.

to give to their fathers, 2. In the which thou shalt bless and give to them individually and confirm unto them their inheritance in me and establish for them the kingdom, and thou shalt appoint them prefectures according to the good pleasure of their Lord in judgment and righteousness. 3. And (it will come to pass) in the sixth year after they enter into the land, that thereafter they shall be ruled by chiefs and kings for eighteen years, and during nineteen years the ten tribes will be apostates. 4. And the twelve tribes will go down

2. *Their inheritance in me.* This is a peculiar phrase, but Rönsch supports it by 2 Sam. xx. 1: "Neither have we inheritance in the son of Jesse" (*Z.f.W.T.* 1869, p. 221); but his later suggestion on this passage is possibly better, in which he takes the Latin "in me" to be a corruption of "in eam." See crit. note on II. 2.

Appoint them prefectures. The text is obscure. See crit. note (p. 60). We might render also: "appoint them local magistrates." These might be the שריים mentioned in Deut. xvi. 18; 1 Chron. xxiii. 4, xxvi. 29.

3. *In the sixth year.* The conquest of Canaan occupied five years. Cf. Josh. xiv. 10; Joseph. *Ant.* v. 1. 19: ἔτος δὲ πέμπτον ἤδη παρελήλυθει καὶ Χαναανίων οὐκέτι οὐδεὶς ὑπολέλειπτο.

For eighteen years. Each year signifies a reign or ruler. The

"chiefs and kings" are the fifteen judges and the three kings, Saul, David, and Solomon.

And during nineteen years the ten tribes will be apostates. These are the nineteen kings of Israel from Jeroboam to Hoshea. In these two statements the writer anticipates for the moment the course of history. In the next verse he turns back to record the removal of the ark by David to Jerusalem.

4. *And the twelve tribes will go down, etc.* 2 Sam. vi. 1, 2, 17. See crit. note (p. 61).

The God of heaven. Cf. iv. 4, x. 3. This expression, which is found in Gen. xxiv. 7, was a favourite one amongst the post-exilic Jews, Ezra v. 11, vi. 9, 10, vii. 12, 21, 23; Dan. ii. 18, etc.

The God of heaven will make, etc. The building of the temple under Solomon is here referred to.

The court of His tabernacle. See crit. note (p. 62).

and transfer the tabernacle of the testimony. Then the God of heaven will make the court of His tabernacle and the tower of His sanctuary, and the two holy tribes will be (there) established: 5. But the ten tribes will establish kingdoms for themselves according to their own ordinances. 6. And they will offer sacrifices throughout twenty years: 7. And seven will entrench the walls, and I will protect nine, but (four) will transgress the covenant of the Lord, and profane the oath which the Lord made with them. 8. And they will sacrifice their sons to strange gods, and they will set up idols in the sanctuary, to worship them. 9. And in the house of the Lord they will work impiety and

Tower of His sanctuary. See crit. note (p. 62).

And the two holy tribes, etc. Only two tribes will remain faithful to the temple so built. This calls for a reference to the action of the ten tribes, which is given in the text verse.

5. This statement relative to the ten tribes is really parenthetical. It was called out by the prediction that (only) the two tribes would preserve their allegiance to the temple.

6. The writer, after the parenthetical reference to the ten tribes in ver. 5, returns here to the history of the two.

Offer sacrifices throughout twenty years. The twenty years designate the twenty sovereigns of Judah from Rehoboam onwards, including Athaliah.

7. *Seven will entrench the walls, i.e.* seven kings will advance the strength and prosperity of Judah—Rehoboam, Abijah, Asa, Jehoshaphat, Jehoram, Ahaziah, Athaliah.

I will protect nine, i.e. nine kings will enjoy the divine protection — Joash, Amaziah, Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, Hezekiah, Manasseh, Amon, Josiah.

(Four) will transgress, i.e. Jehoahaz, Jehoiakim, Jehoiachin, Zedekiah.

Transgress . . . oath. See crit. note (pp. 62, 63).

8. *Sacrificed their sons, etc.* 2 Kings xvi. 3; Ps. cvi. 37, 38; Ezek. xvi. 20, xx. 26; Hos. xi. 2.

Set up idols in the sanctuary. Cf. Ezek. viii. 8-16.

9. This verse is clearly based

engrave every (form) of beast, (even) many abominations.

III. And in those days a king from the east will come against them and cover their land with (his) cavalry. 2. And he will burn their colony with fire together with the holy temple of the Lord, and he will carry away all the holy vessels. 3. And he will cast forth all the people, and he will take them to the land of his nativity, yea he will take the two tribes with him. 4. Then the two tribes will call upon the ten tribes, and will be indignant as a lioness on the dusty plains, being hungry and thirsty. 5. And they will cry aloud: "Righteous

on Ezek. viii. 9, 10. Thus "in the house of the Lord they will work impiety," is derived from viii. 9, and the remaining words from viii. 10. See crit. note for the restoration of the text.

III. 1. *A king from the east.* Nebuchadnezzar, 588-586 B.C.

2. *Colony.* This word is due either to the Greek or Latin translator, and points to the fact that when the translation was made Jerusalem had been rebuilt by Hadrian as a Roman colony under the name Aelia Capitolina. See also V. 6, VI. 9. The original may have used "city" or "place"; cf. IV. 7.

All the holy vessels. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 7. According to Dan. i. 2, part of these had been carried away in the reign of Jehoiakim; cf. Jer. xxvii. 19, 20. A tradition current in the first century of our era recounts

that on the destruction of Solomon's temple the holy vessels were concealed by angels (Apoc. Bar. vi.) or by Jeremiah (2 Macc. ii. 4-8) in order to preserve them for the future Messianic kingdom. See also Bammidbar rab, 15. The writer of this book was not apparently acquainted with this tradition.

3, 4. *Will be indignant.* See crit. note (pp. 64, 65). *Hungry and thirsty.* Cf. Apoc. Bar. lxxvii. 14.

5. *Righteous and holy is the Lord.* Ps. cxlv. 17, *δικαίος κύριος . . . καὶ ὅσιος*, and Vulgate, *justus Dominus et sanctus*. Pss. Sol. x. 6; Dan. ix. 14.

Righteous . . . is the Lord, for inasmuch as, etc. Cf. Apoc. Bar. lxxvii. 3, 4. Both here and in the Apoc. Bar. the calamities of Judah are said to be due to the wickedness of Israel. In the

and holy is the Lord, for, inasmuch as ye have sinned, we too, in like manner, have been carried away with you, together with our children." 6. Then the ten tribes will mourn on hearing the reproaches of the two tribes, 7. And they will say: "What have we done unto you, brethren? Surely this tribulation has not come on all the house of Israel?" 8. And all the tribes will mourn crying unto heaven and saying: 9. "God of Abraham God of Isaac and God of Jacob, remember Thy covenant which Thou didst make with them, and the oath which Thou didst swear unto them by Thyself, that their seed should never fail in the land which Thou hast given them." 10. Then

latter book, however, lxxvii. 10, Jer. xi. 17, Dan. ix. 7, and the Apocryphal Bar. ii. 26, these are attributed to the wickedness of both Israel and Judah.

Together with our children. These words are found at the end of ver. 4 in the MS., but there they are impossible. See crit. note (p. 65).

7. Baldensperger (*Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*, p. 30, note) thinks that if we could admit the date of the book to be after 70 A.D. the word "tribulation" here might hint also at a recently experienced calamity.

8. *Unto heaven.* Heaven seems here to be used as equivalent to God. This usage appears first in Dan. iv. 23. It is frequent later. Cf. Matt. v. 34.

9. *The oath . . . that their*

seed should never fail in the land. Gen. xvii. 8; cf. for phraseology Pss. Sol. xvii. 5: σὺ ὤμοσας αὐτῷ περὶ τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ μὴ ἐκλείπειν . . . βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ; also Test. XII. Patriar., Jud. 22.

10-13. These verses are either the source of Apoc. Bar. lxxxiv. 2-5, or both passages are derived from a common original. The passage in Baruch is: 2. "Remember that formerly Moses assuredly called heaven and earth to witness against you, and said: 'If ye transgress the law, ye shall be dispersed; but if ye keep it, ye shall be kept.' 3. And other things he used to say unto you when ye, the twelve tribes, were together in the desert. 4. And after his death ye cast them away from you: on this account there

they will remember me, saying, in that day, tribe unto tribe and each man unto his neighbour: 11. "Is not this that which Moses did then declare unto us in prophecies, who suffered many things in Egypt and in the Red Sea and in the wilderness during forty years: 12. And assuredly called heaven and earth to witness against us, that we should not transgress His commandments, in the which he was a mediator unto us? 13. Behold these things have befallen us after his death according to his words and according to his declaration, as he declared to us at that time, yea behold these have taken place even to our being carried away captive into the country of the east." 14.

came upon you what had been predicted. 5. *And now Moses used to tell you before they befell you, and lo! they have befallen you.*" I have italicised the portions which are undoubtedly of close kin. Cf. Dan. ix. 11-13.

11. *In Egypt and in the Red Sea and the wilderness forty years.* These words are found exactly as they stand here, and likewise in reference to Moses in Stephen's speech in Acts vii. 36: οὗτος ἐξήγαγεν αὐτοὺς, ποιήσας τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα ἐν τῇ Αἰγύπτῳ, καὶ ἐν Ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσῃ, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἔτη τεσσαράκοντα. The fact of their having a partial parallel in Apoc. Bar. lxxxiv. 3 (see above) seems to preclude the possibility of their being an interpolation here.

12. *Assuredly called heaven*

and earth to witness. See crit. note (pp. 66, 67). Deut. iv. 26, xxx. 19, xxxi. 28; Apoc. Bar. xix. 1, lxxxiv. 2.

Mediator. See I. 14, note.

That we should not transgress His commandments. Apoc. Bar. lxxxiv. 2.

13. *And behold these things.* See crit. note (p. 67).

After his death. See crit. note (p. 67). *Yea behold,* etc. See crit. note.

Into the country of the east. See crit. note.

14. *Seventy and seven years.* This refers back, no doubt, to Jeremiah's prophecy of seventy years' captivity, Jer. xxv. 11, 12, xxix. 10. This prophecy is referred to in Dan. ix. 2, and interpreted in ix. 24 to mean seventy weeks of years. How

Who will be also in bondage for about seventy and seven years.

IV. Then there will enter one who is over them, and he will spread forth his hands, and kneel upon his knees and pray on their behalf saying: 2. "Lord of all, King on the lofty throne, who rulest the world, and didst will that this people should be Thine elect people, then (indeed) Thou didst will that Thou shouldst be called their God, according to the covenant which Thou didst make with their fathers. 3. And yet they have gone in captivity into another land with their wives and their children, and around the gates of strange peoples and where there is great vanity. 4. Regard and have compassion on them, O Lord of heaven." 5. Then God will remember them on account of the covenant which He made with their fathers, and

the limits of this period are to be determined, it has hitherto been impossible to define. That the same impossibility attaches to the present time-determination is therefore not strange. If seventy-seven years be taken as weeks of years (as in Daniel), the total is 539 years. This subtracted from 588, when Jerusalem was destroyed, gives 49 B.C. But this is not intelligible. Merx thinks there is a play on the words seventy-seven in the Semitic. See crit. note. Can seventy and seven signify here an indefinite number, as it actually does in

the O. and N.T. (cf. Gen. iv. 24; Mt. xviii. 22).

IV. 1. *One*, i.e. Daniel; cf. Dan. ix. 4-19.

2. *Rulest the world*. See xi. 17, note.

Thine elect people. Cf. Isa. xlii. 1, xliii. 20, lxv. 15, etc.

2, 3. Observe the contrast existing between Israel's reasonable expectations and their actual lot—God's chosen covenanted people the slave of an idolatrous human power.

3. *Vanity*, i.e. idolatry. See crit. note (pp. 68, 69).

4. Cf. Dan. ix. 18, 19; Apoc. Bar. xlviii. 18.

He will manifest His compassion in those times also. 6. And He will put it into the mind of a king to have compassion on them, and he will send them off to their land and country. 7. Then some portions of the tribes will go up and they will come to their appointed place, and they will entrench the place renewing (it). 8. And the two tribes will continue in their prescribed faith, sad and

6. *A king, i.e.* Cyrus; cf. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 22, 23; Ezra i. 1-4.

8. *Lamenting because they will not be able to offer sacrifices*, etc. Worship in the second temple during the Persian period and later was discredited by several writers in different centuries and no doubt on different grounds. Thus Malachi (i. 7) writes: "ye offer polluted bread upon Mine altar." Next, in the Eth. En. lxxxix. 73 the sacrifices are declared to be unclean under the symbolical words; "all the bread on it was polluted and not pure." Our next reference to the low estimation in which the worship of the second temple was held is found in the Apoc. Bar. lxxviii. 5, 6: "And at that time, after a little interval, Zion will again be builded, and its offerings will again be restored; and the priests will return to their ministry, and again the Gentiles will come to glorify it. Nevertheless, not as fully as in the beginning." The passages from Malachi and the Eth. En. seem to arraign only the imperfect character of the victims, and

the spirit of those that offer them. That in the Apoc. Bar. may not amount to anything more than a reflection on the lesser glory of the second temple as compared with that of the first, such as we find in Hag. ii. 3: "Who is left among you that saw this house in its former glory? and how do ye see it now?" Cf. also Ezra iii. 12.

But the passage in our text seems to go deeper. It implies an imperfection attaching to the validity of the entire temple service. There is, indeed, no objection to sacrifice as such in this book; hence no Essenic tenet is to be sought for here. The writer's views may possibly be explained on the ground that he regarded it as impossible for Israel to render perfect worship so long as they were subject to heathen powers. From these powers God alone could deliver them. They were not, as we gather from IX., to attempt this task themselves. God Himself would achieve it for them when they duly repented, I. 17. The writer is a Pharisaic quietist.

lamenting because they will not be able to offer sacrifices to the Lord of their fathers. 9. And the ten tribes will increase and multiply among the Gentiles during the time of their captivity.

V. And when the times of chastisement draw nigh and vengeance arises through the kings who share in their guilt and punish them, 2. They themselves also will be divided as to the truth. 3. Wherefore it hath come to pass: "They will

9. *Multiply among the Gentiles during the time of their captivity.* See crit. note (pp. 70, 71) for the grounds for this emendation, and for the passages from contemporary writers supporting the present statement.

V. 1. *Vengeance arises through the kings who share in their guilt.* The writer shows that there was a special Nemesis in the instruments of their chastisement; for the very people, whose manners and customs they were so eager to adopt to the destruction of Hebrew religion and character, became in due course the actual means through which a righteous vengeance overtook them. We find the same thought expressed in reference to the Hellenising priests of Jason's time in 2 Macc. iv. 16: "By reason whereof sore calamity came upon them; for they had them to be their enemies and avengers whose customs they followed so eagerly, and unto whom they desired to be like in all things" (*ὡν ἐξήλουν τὰς ἀγωγὰς καὶ καθάπαν ἤθελον ἐξομοιοῦσθαι, τοὺτους πολεμίους καὶ τιμώρητὰς ἔσχον*).

Here as in our text the writer regards the persecution under the Seleucidae, especially Antiochus, as a judgment on the Hellenising and apostasies of the leaders of the nation.

2. *They . . . will be divided as to the truth.* The enormities of the Sadducean priesthood promoted in the way of reaction a religious awakening among the scribes, and gave birth to what was later known as the Pharisaic party. The origin of this party is symbolically described in the Eth. En. xc. 6, 7 as taking place at this time. (See my edition *in loc.*) Schmidt-Merx wrongly describe these two parties as the war party of the Maccabeans and the stricter Chasids. Hilgenfeld strangely interprets these words as referring to the dispersion (*διασπορά*) under the Seleucids, and the preceding verse to the Persian kings. The two verses refer to the period of the Seleucid domination. There is no question of the Maccabees as yet.

3. It is impossible to trace this quotation, but portions of it

turn aside from righteousness and approach iniquity, and they will defile with pollutions the house of their worship," and "they will go a whoring after strange gods." 4. For they will not follow the

—at least their phraseology—may be found in the O.T. For "turn aside from righteousness," cf. Ezek. iii. 20; for "they will defile . . . the house of their worship," cf. Ezek. xlv. 7: "Ye have brought in aliens . . . to be in My sanctuary, to profane it, even My house"; Zeph. iii. 4: "her priests have profaned the sanctuary"; see also Pss. Sol. i. 9, where of the Jewish priesthood it is said: ἐβεβήλωσαν τὰ ἅγια κυρίου ἐν βεβηλώσει, and viii. 26: ἐμίαναν ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ τὰ ἡγιασμένα τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Θεοῦ. The clause "will go a whoring after strange gods" is found in Deut. xxxi. 16.

3, 4. All previous writers have, I believe, wrongly interpreted these verses. They have taken them as referring to the early Maccabean high priests and their Sadducean supporters. But there are certain statements here which make such an interpretation impossible. i. The words "will go a whoring after strange gods" cannot possibly be applied to the Maccabean high priests, 160–103. ii. In no case could the latter be described as those "who are no priests." No such charge is brought against them in all Jewish literature, whereas they are everywhere acknowledged to be of true priestly descent; see 1 Macc. ii. 1–5; Joseph. *Ant.* xii. 6. 1. They were

sprung from Joiarib or Jehoiarib who returned from the Captivity, 1 Macc. ii. 1; 1 Chron. ix. 10; Neh. xi. 10, xii. 6, 19. iii. Finally, in vi. 2 of this book the statement that the Maccabees should be succeeded by one who was "not of the race of the priests," *i.e.* Herod, shows that the writer regarded the Maccabees as being of priestly descent.

But the very facts that make against the application of these verses to the Maccabees make it clear that they can only be rightly explained as descriptive of the high priests who held office previous to the Maccabees, together with their Sadducean following. i. There was every ground for charging the paganising high priests Jason and Menelaus with "going a whoring after strange gods." Thus, not to dwell upon the contribution Jason sent to Tyre to be expended in a sacrifice to Hercules in that city, 2 Macc. iv. 19, 20, he set up a palaestra under the citadel, in which the young nobles of Jerusalem practised the Greek games, and even the priests, forsaking their service at the altar to do so. This Jason also, called in 2 Macc. iv. 13 "that ungodly wretch, and no high priest," encouraged "Greek fashions" and "heathen manners," "put down the institutions that were according to law, and brought up new

truth of God, but some will pollute the altar with the very gifts which they offer to the Lord, who

customs against the law," 2 Macc. iv. 11. Jason is finally declared in 2 Macc. v. 8 to be "hated as a forsaker of the laws, and being had in abomination as an open enemy of his country and countrymen." The above facts will amply account for such words also as "they will approach iniquity, and they will defile with pollutions the house of their worship," in ver. 3, and "some will pollute the altar with the very gifts which they offer," in ver. 4. For similar charges against the priesthood, cf. the quotations given on ver. 3.

ii. But the words conclusive for our interpretation are: "some . . . who are not priests but slaves, sons of slaves." We have shown above that the clause "who are not priests" cannot in any case be referred to the Maccabees. We have now to show that it applies to the Hellenising high priests under Antiochus Epiphanes. Amongst these we have undoubtedly in Menelaus a high priest who was not of priestly extraction at all, but was of the tribe of Benjamin. In 2 Macc. iv. 23 he is called the brother of Simon. This Simon, a *Benjamite*, was a Hellenising governor of the temple, 2 Macc. iii. 4. Josephus represents Menelaus as a brother of Onias III., *Ant.* xii. 4. 10, 5. 1; but wrongly, as is universally admitted. This illegitimate appointment was exactly in keeping with the policy of

Antiochus. It was his aim, not only to outrage the Jewish Law, but to procure its entire abolition. Although this is the only authenticated instance of the high priesthood being held by one who was not of priestly descent, Grimm and other scholars are right in concluding that the occurrence of similar irregularities in appointments to the high priesthood is implied in 1 Macc. vii. 14. There the Asidaeans declare, on the appointment of Alkimus to the high priesthood, that they could suffer nothing at the hands of the army which was marching against them, because "one that is a priest of the seed of Aaron is come with the army."

Slaves, sons of slaves. These words have been referred to the Maccabean high priests; and the passage in Josephus, *Ant.* xiii. 10. 5, has been quoted in support of this view, where, at a banquet given by Hyrcanus, a Pharisee named Eleazar requested Hyrcanus to lay down the high priesthood, on the ground that his mother had been a captive during the reign of Antiochus. This statement, which Josephus declares to be false, is repeated in the Talmud. But, (1) as we have already seen in the preceding notes, there can be no reference here to the Maccabean high priests; and (2) the first reference to them is found in vi. 1. If v. 4 already referred to the Maccabean high priests, we should not find in vi. 1 the

are not priests but slaves, sons of slaves. 5. And many in those times will respect the persons of the rich and receive gifts, and wrest judgment [on receiving presents]. 6. And on this account the

special record that the Maccabees called themselves high priests of God. The phrase "slaves, sons of slaves," then, is to be interpreted, not of the Maccabees, but of their predecessors. In this regard it is full of significance, and points to the condition of complete degradation in which the holders of this office stood under Antiochus; for they were the nominees and absolute tools of that despot, being made and unmade by him at pleasure. Thus Onias III. was deposed to make room for Jason, and Jason in turn to make room for Menelaus, 2 Macc. iv. 7-9, 23-29.

5. *And many in those times.* The Latin text here is, *qui enim magistri sunt doctores eorum illis temporibus*. In the crit. note (pp. 72, 73) I have shown that *doctores eorum* is an incorrect marginal gloss in the Hebrew MS. on the preceding words *והרבים*, which are here wrongly rendered by *qui enim magistri sunt*. These "many" were the Sadducean party who supported the Hellenising high priests. Probably the reference may be more specific, and the "many" may signify the large Hellenising Sadducean majority in the Sanhedrim in Jerusalem. The Sanhedrim was the chief court for the administration of civil and criminal justice. See p. 26.

Respect the persons of the rich. See crit. note (p. 73).

Deut. xvi. 19 is the source of this and the two following clauses: "Thou shalt not wrest judgment; thou shalt not respect persons; neither shalt thou take a gift."

Receive gifts and . . . wrest judgment. See preceding note; also crit. note (p. 73).

[*On receiving presents*]. I have bracketed this phrase as a dittography. See crit. note (pp. 73, 74), where I have shown that, if it is genuine, as it may be, we should probably be right in regarding *accipientes munera* in the preceding line as $\delta\omega\rho\lambda\eta\pi\tau\omicron\upsilon\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ = בזעִים בָּצַע = greedy of gain (cf. Prov. xv. 27), and accordingly render the whole verse: "And many in those times will respect the persons of the rich, and be greedy of gain, and wrest judgment on receiving presents." In this case 1 Sam. viii. 3 was clearly before the mind of the writer: "And his sons walked not in his ways, but *turned aside after lucre, and took bribes, and perverted judgment.*"

5, 6. *Will forsake the Lord.* See crit. note (p. 74).

Will be ready to judge for money, etc. See crit. note (p. 75). Cf. Isa. v. 23.

VIII. IX. The persecution of the Jews under Antiochus; the breach between the Chasids and the early Maccabees, and the resumption by the former of

colony and the borders of their habitation will be filled with lawless deeds and iniquities: they will forsake the Lord: they will be impious judges: they will be ready to judge for money as each may wish.

VI. Then there will be raised up unto them

their quietistic attitude. These chapters should be read immediately after V., where they belonged originally. For the grounds for this conclusion see notes *in loc.*

VI. 1. *Kings bearing rule, and they will call themselves high priests.* See crit. note. Previous scholars have referred these words to Antigonus' assumption of the title of king in 104 B.C. It is true, no doubt, that Antigonus was the first to do so; but, on the following grounds, it seems clear that the line of kings mentioned in the text begins, not with Antigonus, but with Jonathan or Judas. For (1) the name "king" is used loosely in this book: it does not necessarily mean anything more than commander or prince. Thus the Roman general Varus is called "a powerful king" in vi. 8. Hence this title could be used even of Judas, who was the *de facto* ruler of the Jews; and on still better grounds of Jonathan, who was invested by Alexander Balas of Syria with princely rank through the symbols of the purple robe and diadem in 153; and on the most adequate grounds of Simon, who was the first independent Maccabean ruler of his nation. (2)

Now, according to the text, *their assumption of the high priesthood is regarded as subsequent to their assumption of the office of supreme military and civil rulers of the nation.* Hence, as the office of high priest was usurped as early as 153 B.C. by Jonathan, and this usurpation made legitimate, and the office declared to be hereditary in the Maccabean line in 141 B.C. by a council of the nation (1 Macc. xiv. 41), the words "*kings bearing rule*" must be referred to the Maccabean rulers previous, at all events, to 141 B.C. Hence this verse (vi. 1) embraces the entire Maccabean dynasty from Judas, 165 B.C., to Antigonus, 37 B.C., who was succeeded by Herod.

High priests of God. The Latin, which is here *sacerdotes summi Dei*, "priests of the Most High God," I have, in my critical text, necessarily emended into *summos sacerdotes Dei* (see crit. note, p. 75); for (1) such a title would be unparalleled in connection with the Maccabees. In 1 and 2 Macc., and in the *Antiquities* and *Jewish Wars* of Josephus, they are simply described in their sacred character as "high priests," or "high priests of the nation." (2) The

Geiger
del 4/3

Kings bearing rule, and they will call themselves high priests of God: they will assuredly work iniquity in the holy of holies. 2. And an insolent king will succeed them, who will not be of the race of the priests, a man bold and shameless, and he will judge them as they shall deserve. 3.

Jewish high priesthood was never, so far as I can discover, called a priesthood of the Most High God. (3) Again, if the divine title were here "the Most High," we should find, according to universal Biblical usage, *Dei summi* or *altissimi* or *excelsi* (cf. Gen. xiv. 18, 19, 20, 22; Ps. lvii. 2, lxxviii. 56; Dan. iii. 26, v. 18, 21; Mark v. 7; Luke viii. 28; Heb. vii. 1), and not *summi Dei*. (4) *Summi sacerdotes* is in many instances a Vulg. rendering of ἀρχιερεῖς (cf. Mark xiv. 47, 53, 54, 60, 61, 63, 66; Acts xxiii. 4). (5) The phrase "the high priest of God" is found in Acts xxiii. 4.

The Maccabees had no wish to differentiate themselves from the high priests that preceded them. Their claim to this office, so far as they had any, rested on their Aaronic descent.

Will assuredly work iniquity. On this Hebraism see crit. note.

2. This verse refers to Herod the Great, who reigned from 37 to 4 B.C. He could not assume the high priest's office, as he was not even a full-born Jew, much less of priestly descent. Josephus, *Ant.* xiv. 15. 2, calls him ἡμιουδαῖος.

Not of the race of the priests. Herod was the son of Antipater

of Idumea, and not of Jewish descent, according to Joseph. *Ant.* xiv. 1. 3; *Bell.* i. 6. 2. Our text does not go so far. Its silence seems to concede the Jewish origin of Antipater, and thus to agree with the statement of Nicolas of Damascus to that effect (*Ant.* xiv. 1. 3). See Schürer, i. i. 314, 315, notes.

Judge them as they deserve. The persons here declared to be deserving of punishment may be (a) the surviving members of the Maccabean family, all of whom were ultimately cut off by Herod; (b) the Sadducean aristocracy forty-five of whom he had executed on becoming king (*Ant.* xv. 1. 2; *Bell.* i. 18. 4). To the Pharisees, on the other hand, Herod was on the whole favourable. Even when they refused to take the oath of allegiance, they were spared at the intercession of Pollio and Sameas. The Essenes were also excused, but not the rest of the people. See *Ant.* xv. 10. 4. (c) Or else the nation at large, as in VI. 1. We should observe that VI. 4, 5 support the last interpretation.

3. *Cut off their chief men, i.e.* the Sadducean nobles. See preceding note.

Destroy (them) in secret places. Murders of this secret sort are

And he will cut off their chief men with the sword, and will destroy (them) in secret places, so that no one may know where their bodies are. 4. He will slay the old and the young, and he will not spare. 5. Then the fear of him will be bitter unto them in their land. 6. And he will execute judgments on them as the Egyptians executed upon them, during thirty and four years, and he will punish them. 7. And he will beget children, who succeeding him will rule for shorter periods. 8.

reported in Joseph. *Ant.* xv. 10. 4: πολλοί τε καὶ φανερώς καὶ λεληθότως εἰς τὸ φρούριον ἀναγόμενοι, τὴν Ἱερικανίαν, ἐκεῖ διεφθέρωντο.

4. Perhaps, as Hilgenfeld and Volkmar suggest, we should omit the *et* before *non* and translate: "He will slay the old, and the young he will not spare." Cf. Jer. li. 3.

5. Cf. for phraseology 2 Macc. vi. 3.

6. *Thirty and four years.* Herod reigned thirty-four years after the death of Antigonos, and thirty-seven after he had been declared king by the Romans. Cf. Joseph. *Ant.* xvii. 8. 1; *Bell.* i. 33. 8.

7. *Children who . . . will rule for shorter periods.* See crit. note. Although there is some corruption in the text, there is no difficulty as to the sense. Herod's sons, it states, are to reign for shorter periods than their father. Now this was true of Archelaus alone; for Antipas reigned forty-three

years, and Philip thirty-seven. From these facts we must conclude that, as Herod died 4 B.C., this book must have been written earlier, at all events, than 30 A.D. Reuss, on the other hand (*Die Geschichte der h. Schriften A.T.*, 1890, pp. 738-740), does not agree that these words necessarily determine the date. Philip and Antipas did indeed reign longer than their father, but our author, he urges, was thinking only of Archelaus and Agrippa, "die allein für einen Jerusalemer Interesse hatten." In this view Reuss is followed by Rosenthal and Baldensperger.

8. *Into their parts, cohorts, etc.* See crit. note.

A powerful king. Varus, governor of Syria, who suppressed a rebellion of the Jews against the Roman authority in 4 B.C. See Joseph. *Ant.* xvii. 10. 9, 10, 11. 1; *Bell.* ii. 5. 1-3.

Burn a part of their temple. The temple was set fire to, not by Varus, but by the soldiers

Into their parts cohorts and a powerful king of the west will come, who will conquer them: 9. And he will take them captive, and burn a part of their temple with fire, (and) will crucify some around their colony.

VII. And when this is done the times will be ended, in a moment the (second) course will be (ended), the four hours will come. 2. They will be forced 3. And, in the time of

under his lieutenant Sabinus. See Joseph. *Ant.* xvii. 10. 2; *Bell.* ii. 3. 3. The injuries done to the temple on this occasion were not made good till as late as Nero's reign, though 18,000 men were employed in the restoration. See *Ant.* xx. 9. 7.

Will crucify some, etc. 2000 were crucified by Varus (*Ant.* xvii. 10. 10).

VII. 1. *And when this is done the times will be ended.* With these words the actual history recounted by our author, as Ewald, Wieseler, Dillmann, and Schürer have recognised, comes to a close. We have arrived at the date at which he is writing. Up to this point his historical allusions have been easy to interpret. A series of predictions follow, couched by their author in enigmatical symbols to begin with, and afterwards corrupted by translators or transcribers beyond the possibility of restoration.

2. It is worse than idle to attempt to deal with this verse till we know something about its actual wording. On the for-

lorn attempts made to restore it, by Hilgenfeld, Volkmar, Merx, Colani, and Wieseler, see crit. note (pp. 77, 78).

3-10. Who were the persons aimed at by the writer? They are evidently contemporaries. The picture is drawn from life. And yet there is the greatest diversity of opinion among scholars as to the class designed by the writer. They have been taken to be—(i.) *The Herodian princes*, by Hilgenfeld, *Mess. Jud.* 464, 465. But there are many objections to this identification.

(ii.) *The Pharisees*, (a) in the first decade after Herod's death, by Ewald, *History of Israel*, v. 367, note 5 (Eng. tr.), Drummond, Dillmann, Schürer, II. iii. 79, 80; (b) between 54-64 A.D., by Schmidt-Merx (Merx, *Archiv. f. Wissenschaftl. Erforschung des A.T.*, vol. i. p. 121, 1868). Though certain traits in these verses seem to favour this view, the prevailing tone of the entire passage makes it impossible. The persons here arraigned are unblushing Epicureans, gluttonous men and

these, scornful and impious men will rule, saying

winebibbers. Now, although nearly every other vice has been laid to the charge of the Pharisees, even their worst enemies have not accused them of *open* gluttony and drunkenness. Indeed, the Pharisees were decidedly ascetic in character, according to the testimony of Josephus; "the Pharisees," he writes, "make little of the pleasures of the table, and do not surrender themselves to the comforts of the body" (*Ant.* xviii. 1. 3: οἱ τε γὰρ Φαρισαῖοι τὴν διαίταν ἐξευτελίζουσιν, οὐδὲν εἰς τὸ μαλακώτερον ἐνδιδόντες. In Matt. xxiii. 25, indeed, they are accused of *secret* profligacy, "but within they are full from extortion and excess" (ἐξ ἀρπαγῆς καὶ ἀκρασίας).

But this ascetic tone was not universally characteristic of the Pharisees after 70 A.D. Hence this objection will not tell against the views of Philippi (*Das Buch Henoch*, p. 176) and Colani (*Revue de Theol.* 1868, 2nd part, pp. 73-79), who interpret the passage as referring to the Pharisees in the earlier half of the second century. Colani, in particular, identifies the class assailed in the text with the Jewish doctors at Jabne and Usha. At the head of the Sanhedrim at these places was a president (= Nasi), who lived in princely luxury, and enjoyed immense authority over the Jews of the Dispersion. Such phrases, he urges, as "we shall be as princes," "we shall have feastings and luxury," would apply to him and his; likewise "do not

touch me," etc., in their relation to "the people of the land." He points out, further, that the words *dicentes se haec facere propter misericordiam* are to be explained by a decree of the Sanhedrim in that period, which forbade a man to give more than $\frac{1}{4}$ th of his fortune to the poor. Colani's views are decidedly ingenious, and might win our assent if he could likewise convince us of the late date he assigns to the book, *i.e.* after 136 A.D. But that a Jew, writing the history of his people in its main outlines, should omit all mention of the final and completed destruction of Jerusalem under Titus, and pass on at a bound to the national troubles which were consummated by the erection of Aelia Capitolina on the sacred site of Jerusalem, is indeed simply impossible. But this date of Colani is dealt with elsewhere.

(iii.) *The Pharisees and the Sadducees*, (a) in 4 B.C.-6 A.D. This view was first advocated by Wieseler (*Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.* 1868, pp. 642, 643), who referred vers. 3, 4 to the latter, and 6-10 to the former. (b) Soon after the fall of Jerusalem, 70 A.D. This view is urged by Rosenthal (*Vier Apocryph. Bücher*, 1885, pp. 20, 21, 25-30), who follows Wieseler in attributing vers. 3, 4 to the Sadducees, and 6-10 to the Pharisees. But this two-fold interpretation is just as untenable as those that precede. The attempt to assign vers. 3, 4 to one class, and 6-10 to another, can only proceed from a super-

ficial study of the passage ; for if the persons denounced in ver. 4 are charged with gluttony, this is no less true in 8 ; if in 3 they are said to hold high office, they do so also in 8 ; if in 3 they proclaim their justice, in 10 they assert their purity ; if in 3 and 4 they are declared to be "deceitful," "impious," "treacherous," in 6-10 they are denounced as "deceitful," "impious," "filled with lawlessness."

We have therefore one and the same class of persons to deal with in the entire passage, and these are not Pharisees prior to to 70 A.D., as we have already seen under ii. (b). But, according to Rosenthal, the classes designed in vers. 6-10 are the Pharisees, 70-90 A.D., *i.e.* R. Jochanan ben Sakkai and his companions and pupils, who forsook Jerusalem during the siege and established themselves at Jabne. That a small body of learned men, whose main pursuit was the study and application of the law, who alone in the time of universal prostration held on high the standard of national hope and faith, could be so described by any thoughtful and learned Jew of that period (a Zealot, as Rosenthal supposes), this is, I confess, simply incredible. Besides, there is not a shred of evidence to show that the rabbis of Jabne (70-90) could with the faintest approach to truth be described as gluttons, drunkards, traitors, hypocrites, and murderers. Other arguments, on the ground of chronology, etc., might be advanced against the hypothesis of Rosenthal, but no more are needed.

(iv.) *The Roman procurators*, by Baldensperger (*Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*, 1888, p. 31). This is a very attractive interpretation, and several of the charges made in the text, such as those of gluttony, drunkenness, and murder, could be amply substantiated against the Roman governors. On the other hand, there are phrases that cannot with any propriety be applied to them ; *i.e.* "do not touch me, lest thou shouldst pollute me" (ver. 10), and "concealing themselves lest they should be recognised."

(v.) *The Sadducees*, (a) in the time of Nerva and Trajan, by Volkmar (p. 105). This view may be at once dismissed. The Sadducees were nobodies at this period. (b) Between 15-70 A.D. This is my own view. It is likewise advocated by Lucius (*Der Essenismus*, 1881, pp. 116-119) and by Geiger (*Jüdische Zeitschrift*, 1868, pp. 45, 46), though they assign no date to the book. The latter adduces such phrases as *regnabunt de his homines pestilentiosi*, and *tanquam principes erimus*. In *dicentes se esse justos*, he points to the play on the words זריקים and צורקים. These Sadduqim or Sadducees cover themselves with the mantle of priestly holiness. They emphasise their special priestly purity, and keep the people afar from them. In the notes that follow, this passage will be dealt with verse by verse, and the chief charges which it brings against the Sadducees justified by parallels from the Psalms of Solomon. I quote from Ryle and James's edition.

that they are just. 4. And these will conceal the wrath of their minds, being treacherous men, self-

It will be sufficient to premise here that from the deposition of Archelaus in 6 till 70 A.D. the government of Judea lay practically in the hands of the Sanhedrim, which was almost wholly Sadducean. Josephus, *Ant.* xx. 10, describes the form of government as aristocratic, as opposed to the monarchical rule of Herod and Archelaus (see Schürer, I. ii. 72). His words are: *μετὰ δὲ τὴν τούτων τελευτὴν, ἀριστοκρατία μὲν ἦν ἡ πολιτεία, τὴν δὲ προστασίαν τοῦ ἔθνους οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ἐπεπίστευντο*. The high priests were but too often the willing tools of the Roman governors. Every abuse in the government would naturally be traced to those who were the actual though not nominal government.

3. *And in the time of these.* I am here supposing that *de his* is a rendering of *ἐπὶ τούτων*. It may, however, be a rendering of *ἐκ τούτων*.

Scornful. We have here an instructive instance which illustrates the necessity of translating, not the Latin before us, but the Greek or Hebrew which it presupposes. The Latin is *homines pestilentiosi* = *ἀνθρωποι λοιμοί* = *נִלְשָׁמ*. This Hebrew phrase is found in Prov. xxix. 8; Is. xxviii. 14; and the Greek in 1 Macc. x. 61. *λοιμός* is a frequent rendering of *נִלְ*. Cf. Ps. i. 1; Prov. xix. 25, xxi. 24, xxii. 10, xxiv. 9.

The *ὑπερηφάνια* ascribed to the Sadducees in the Pss. Sol.

is nearly related to the scorn spoken of in the text; cf. Pss. Sol. ii. 1, 35, iv. 28.

Impious. A natural description of the Sadducees from the standpoint of a Pharisee. It could not, however, be used of a Pharisee.

Will rule. Cf. ver. 8: "we shall be as princes." We have shown in the preceding column that the government of Judea was practically an aristocracy from 6-70 A.D. This aristocracy ruled through the Sanhedrim, which was mainly composed of Sadducees. Cf. Pss. Sol. iv. 1: *ἵνατί σὺ κάθησαι, βέβηλε, ἐν συνεδρίῳ*.

Dicentes se esse justos. Geiger has rightly recognised here a play on the words *δικαιοί*, "Sadducees," and *δίκαιοι*, "righteous."

4. *Conceal the wrath, etc.* See crit. note. Text reads "rouse the wrath," etc.

Treacherous, i.e. δόλιοι. The Sadducees are so described in Pss. Sol. iv. 27: *ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων δολίων καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν*.

Self-pleasers. So the Latin *sibi placentes*. We should probably read "pleasers of the mighty." See crit. note. We should then have in some measure a parallel to the designation so frequently applied to the Sadducees in Pss. Sol. iv., *ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι*. "Pleasers of the mighty" would best be applied to the Sadducees owing to their subservient attitude to Rome and her Roman governors.

Dissemblers. The text gives *ficti*, which may be = *ὑποκριθέν-*

pleasers, dissemblers in all their own affairs and lovers of banquets at every hour of the day, gluttons, gourmands 5. . . . 6. Devourers of the goods of the poor saying that they do so on the ground of their justice, but (in reality) to destroy them, complainers, deceitful, concealing themselves lest they should be recognised, impious, filled with lawlessness and iniquity from sunrise to sunset:

τες; cf. 2 Macc. v. 25, vi. 21, 24, or else = πλάστοι. In Pss. Sol. iv. 7 the Sadducees are spoken of as living ἐν ὑποκρίσει.

Lovers of banquets at every hour of the day. Cf. ver. 8.

Gluttons, gourmands. The text is devoratores, gulæ. Previous editors take gulæ as a genitive or dative in connection with devoratores.

6. *Devourers of the goods of the poor.* A similar charge is brought against the Sadducees in Pss. Sol. iv. 23: ἡρήμωσαν οἴκους πολλοὺς ἀνθρώπων ἐν ἀτιμίᾳ καὶ ἐσκόρπισαν ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ; cf. also iv. 11, 13, 15, xii. 2, 4.

Saying that they do so on the ground of their justice. I have rendered misericordiam in the text by justice. Propter misericordiam = δι' ἐλεημοσύνην. δι' ἐλεημοσύνην, however, taken in its usual sense is hardly intelligible. But the difficulty disappears when we call to mind that this word is a not infrequent rendering in the LXX. of חַסָּד. Thus we are here to translate, not misericordiam, but the Hebrew word it presupposes.

The text thus recovered agrees well with the statement in ver. 3: "saying that they are just," and this second reference to the professed justice of the Sadducee repeats the play upon the name. The Sadducees, though profligates in secret, were stern administrators of justice; see Pss. Sol. iv. 2, 3. They were proverbially severe, Joseph. *Ant.* xx. 9. 1, as the Pharisees were proverbially merciful in judgment, *Ant.* xiii. 10. 6.

7. *Deceitful.* Cf. like statements regarding the Sadducees in Ps. Sol. iv. 4: ἡ γλῶσσα αὐτοῦ ψευδής; 12. οἱ λόγοι αὐτοῦ παραλογισμοὶ εἰς πᾶξιν ἐπίθυμίας ἀδίκου; 14. παρελογίσατο ἐν λόγοις.

Concealing themselves lest they should be recognised. For this also we find an excellent parallel in a similar accusation of the Sadducees in Pss. Sol. iv. 5: ἐν νυκτὶ καὶ ἐν ἀποκρύφοις ἀμαρτάνει ὡς οὐχ ὁρώμενος; I. 7. αἱ ἀμαρτίαι αὐτῶν ἐν ἀποκρύφοις.

Impious, filled with lawlessness and iniquity. παράνομοι and ἀμαρτωλοὶ are standing epithets

8. Saying: "We shall have feastings and luxury, eating and drinking, yea we shall drink our fill, we shall be as princes." 9. And though their hands and their minds touch unclean things, yet their mouth will speak great things, and they will say furthermore: 10. "Do not touch me lest thou shouldst pollute me in the place where I stand" . . .

VIII. And there will come upon them a second

of the Sadducees in the Pss. of Sol. (See Ryle and James's ed. *Introd.* xlv-xlviii.) In iv. 3, moreover, of that book there is a like accusation against the Sadducees to that in our text: αὐτοὺς ἐνοχοὺς ἐν ποικιλῇ ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ ἐν ἀκρασίαις. Cf. Matt. xxiii. 25: "filled from extortion and excess."

From sunrise to sunset. The text is ab oriente usque ad occidentem, which = ἀφ' ἡλίου ἀνατέλλοντος μέχρι δυσμέμου. The Greek can mean either "from east to west" (cf. xi. 8), or "from sunrise to sunset." The context requires the latter meaning. Thus "from sunrise to sunset" is the equivalent of "at every hour of the day," in ver. 4.

8. Cf. ver. 4.

Yea we shall drink our fill. See crit. note.

9. *Though their hands and their minds touch, etc. . . . yet ye.* For the Hebraism see crit. note.

Their mouth will speak great things. Dan. vii. 8, 20.

9, 10. This combination of inward uncleanness and outward

sacerdotal holiness in the Sadducean priesthood is also dwelt upon in Pss. Sol. viii. 13: ἐπάτουν τὸ θυσιαστήριον κυρίου ἀπὸ πάσης ἀκαθαρσίας καὶ ἐν ἀφέδρῳ αἵματος ἐμίλινον τὰς θυσίας ὡς κρέα βέβηλα. See also Pss. i. 8, ii. 14, 15, xvii. 17.

10. *Do not touch me* = יִנְיִנִּי לֹא. This is probably derived from Is. lxxv. 5: "Come not near to me, for I am holier than thou," and the יִנְיִנִּי here may be a corruption of the יִנְיִנִּי in Isa.

VIII.-IX. We have now come to one of the most difficult questions in this difficult book. How are we to regard VIII.-IX.? Two interpretations have been offered. Volkmar, Philippi, and Colani contend that they are a record of what is already past, and constitute in fact a short history of the persecution under Hadrian after the rebellion of Bar Cochba, 136 A.D. All other scholars agree in regarding them as a forecast of what is yet to be—the final woes that are immediately to precede the advent of the theocratic kingdom.

Both views are untenable on

visitation and wrath, such as has not befallen them from the beginning until that time, in which He

the following grounds. The former, which regards VIII.—IX. as a record of the persecution of 136–138, is impossible; for the book was written in the first century (see p. xiii.). The second view is equally impossible; for VIII.—IX. are not a prophecy of the *final* woes. They are clearly designated as “the second visitation” that is to befall Israel (see VIII. 1, note). The first visitation was the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. The last woes could not be described as “the second visitation.” Other facts that support this conclusion will be dealt with in the sequel.

If, then, “the second visitation” is not to be explained as the last woes, how are we to interpret it? Clearly as that which actually befell the Jews under Antiochus Epiphanes. The first visitation was that in which Jerusalem was destroyed under Nebuchadnezzar.

That VIII.—IX. are to be regarded as an account of the persecution under Antiochus is to be inferred from the fact that they furnish an accurate description of that persecution. Its accuracy cannot be gainsaid. We shall prove it presently beyond the possibility of refutation.

But the question now naturally arises, How comes it that we find an accurate description of the Antiochian persecution at a period in our book where it is chronologically impossible? Has

our author not already taken account of it in its proper chronological sequence? These questions lead to the final solution of the problem. For on reviewing the past chapters we are unable to discover a single reference to the persecution by Antiochus and the desecration of the temple, and as we study the context we further discover that such an omission is impossible. For as we proceed we find on investigation the facts to be as follows. *A gap in the history exists between V. and VI.; originally there was no such gap: its place was filled by VIII.—IX.* For (a) in V. the history is brought down to the Hellenising high priests under Antiochus, and VI. opens with a clear reference to the Maccabean princes, beginning with Jonathan. Thus there is not even an allusion to the severities of the Antiochian persecution and the horrors that accompanied it, or to the desecration of the temple (“the abomination that maketh desolate”) and its subsequent reconsecration,—an event that was kept green in the national remembrance by the yearly “Festival of the Dedication.” That one of the most tragic and never-to-be-forgotten periods in Jewish history should be wholly unrecorded is therefore highly improbable. (b) But is more than improbable. It becomes a matter of moral certainty when we further observe that not only the main fortunes of the temple

will stir up against them the King of the kings of the earth and one that ruleth with great power, who will crucify those who confess to their circumcision: 2. And those who conceal (it) he will torture and

are closely followed throughout this book, but even the minor injuries inflicted on it are recorded; cf. II. 4, 8, 9; III. 2; IV. 7, 8; V. 3, 4; VI. 1, 9. Its greatest desecration, therefore, could not have been passed over in silence.

(c) But the moral certainty that there was no such gap originally, is resolved into scientific conviction when, in addition to the former facts, we observe, that in VIII.—IX. we have not only an accurate account of the Antiochian horrors, but also the very fragment that is needed to fill up the gap between V. and VI., and one that harmonises perfectly with that context.

This transposition of the text is due to the final editor. For other transpositions the reader can consult the Introduction (p. xxxv).

VIII. 1. *A second visitation.* It will be seen through reference to the critical notes that the word for "second" is partially restored. That this restoration of Schmidt-Merx is right is clear from IX. 2, where it is referred to again as "a second... visitation."

We have already remarked (p. 29) that the final woes preluding the theocratic kingdom could never have been so described. This "second visitation" is the Antiochian persecution, of which we have a faithful description in the subsequent verses.

Such as has not befallen, etc. From Dan. xii. 1; cf. Jer. xxx. 7; 1 Macc. ix. 27; Matt. xxiv. 21; Rev. xvi. 18. On the resemblance between Matt. xxiv. 21 and our text, see crit. note. The phrase was clearly a current one.

King of the kings of the earth. This title is used of Nebuchadnezzar in Ezek. xxvi. 7; Dan. ii. 37; and of Artaxerxes in Ezra vii. 12. It is a title peculiar to Oriental despots. Hence it is aptly used here of Antiochus iv.

Crucify those who confess to their circumcision. Antiochus forbade circumcision, 1 Macc. i. 48; Joseph. *Ant.* xii. 5. 4: ἐκέλευσε δὲ καὶ μὴ περιτέμνειν αὐτοὺς τὰ τέκνα: certain women who disobeyed this edict were hurled headlong from the city wall, 1 Macc. i. 60, 61; 2 Macc. vi. 10, viii. 4. From 1 Macc. ii. 46, and Joseph. *Ant.* xii. 5. 4, it is clear that this edict was to a large extent obeyed till the Maccabean rising. But Josephus, *Ant.* xii. 5. 4, writes that the best and noblest amongst the Jews refused to obey this and similar commands of the king, and were accordingly tortured and crucified alive — μαστιγοῦμενοι καὶ τὰ σώματα λυμαινόμενοι, ζῶντες ἔτι καὶ ἐμπνέοντες ἀνεσταυροῦντο.

2. *Those who conceal (it).* So I emend, but the text is doubtful. See crit. note.

deliver them up to be bound and led into prison.
 3. And their wives will be given to the gods among the Gentiles, and their young sons will be operated on by the physicians in order to bring forward their foreskin. 4. And others amongst

3. *And their wives will be given to the gods, etc., i.e.* for the cult of Venus, as Colani has observed. According to 2 Macc. vi. 4, the abominations peculiar to this goddess were carried on even in the temple and its courts. Antioch was a centre of this worship—especially its notorious suburb Daphne. Many women were, no doubt, as stated in the text, transported to Antioch and elsewhere to serve these purposes. Josephus, *Ant.* xii. 5. 4, says that upwards of 10,000 men, women, and children were carried away captive by the king.

Their young sons will be operated on by the physicians, etc. Some years before Antiochus adopted ultimate measures in dealing with the Jews, many of the latter of noble birth voluntarily underwent this operation in order to appear like Greeks when they undressed and took part in the Hellenic games established in Jerusalem—1 Macc. i. 15; Joseph. *Ant.* xii. 5. 1: τὴν τῶν αἰδोलῶν περιτομὴν ἐπεκάλυψαν, ὡς ἂν εἶεν καὶ τὰ περὶ τὴν ἀπόδυσιν Ἕλληνες. But, when the king resorted to final measures, not only was circumcision forbidden, as we have seen above, but in the case of young children who were already circumcised, the traces of the circum-

cision were removed by an operation. *To bring forward their foreskin* = ἐπισπᾶν ἀκροβυστίαν αὐτοῖς = לְמִשְׁךְ עֲרֵלָהּ. See Levy's *Neuhebräisches Lex.* iii. 275, 276. Cf. 1 Cor. vii. 18, where this operation is referred to: Wetstein and Lightfoot on 1 Cor. vii. 18, and Schoettgen, *Hor. Hebr.* i. 1157, 1177; Celsus, *De Medic.* vii. 18; Winer, *Realwörterbuch*; Herzog, *Real-Encycl.*; Schenkel, *Bib. Lex.* under article "Beschneidung."

4. *Will be punished by tortures.* Josephus, *Ant.* xii. 5. 4, says of those who refused to obey the commands of Antiochus, that κατὰ πᾶσαν ἡμέραν αἰκίζόμενοι καὶ πικρὰς βασάνους ὑποφέροντες ἀπέθνησκον; also 2 Macc. vi. 28, viii.

And fire. Cf. 2 Macc. vi. 11.

Forced to bear in public their idols. In Amos v. 26, Isa. xlvi. 7, reference is made to Israel having voluntarily carried idols in the wilderness, and later. Cf. also Epist. Jer. 4: ὄψεσθε ἐν Βαβυλῶνι θεοὺς . . . ἐπ' ὧμοις αἰρομένους; and ver. 26. In the preceding passages we have parallels in expression, but in 2 Macc. vi. 7 we have a parallel in fact: γενομένης δὲ Διονυσίων ἑορτῆς ἡναγκάζοντο Κισσοὺς ἔχοντες πομπεύειν τῷ Διονύσῳ. Antiochus compelled the Jews

them will be punished by tortures and fire and sword, and they will be forced to bear in public their idols, (which are as) polluted as are the (shrines) that contain them. 5. And they will likewise be forced by those who torture them to enter their inmost sanctuary, and they will be forced by goads to blaspheme with insolence the name, finally after these things the laws and what they had above their altar.

IX. Then in that day there will be a man of the

to observe his birthday by joining in the Dionysiac festival.

Polluted as are, etc. This is the best I can make of this obscure clause.

5. *Enter their inmost sanctuary*, i.e. the ἄδυτον of the heathen temples. According to Josephus, *Ant.* xv. 5, 4, the Jews were compelled to "build temples and raise idol altars in every city and village, and offer swine upon them every day." Cf. 1 Macc. i. 47.

Blaspheme . . . the name, i.e. נקב אלהים, Lev. xxiv. 11. Israel was commanded to "fear the name," and one of "the seven precepts of the children of Noah" enjoined Israel to "sanctify the name," ברכת השם (*Sanh.* 56b). 2 Macc. viii. 4 speaks of the blasphemies committed against God's name during the Antiochian persecution: γενομένων εἰς τὸ θύμα αὐτοῦ βλασφημιῶν.

The laws, etc. See crit. note.

What they had above (or upon) *their altar*. This clause = אחיזתם, and appears to mean

the sacrifice. Cf. Matt. xxiii. 18.

IX. *Interpretation and historical source of this chapter.* This chapter belongs closely to the preceding one. It is at once *historical* and *parenetic*. It is historical. (a) Its historical root is to be found in 1 Macc. ii. 29-38, where we are told of a large body of men who, with their wives and children, forsook all that they had and took refuge in the caves in the wilderness in order to worship there. When Antiochus' officers were informed of this movement they went in pursuit, and, coming up to the caves where the Jews had taken refuge, they demanded that they should submit to the king's commands. When the refugees refused they were put to the sword, offering no resistance because it was the Sabbath. Their words: "Let us all die in our innocency" (ii. 37), correspond perfectly in sense with the words in our text, ver. 6: "Let us die rather than transgress." Those that were

slain were, according to Josephus, *Ant.* xii. 6. 2, in number about 1000, but many escaped. Let us next try and determine the religious affinities of this body of zealous adherents of the law in the wilderness. In the first place, they were not followers of Mattathias and his party; for it was not till after the massacre that its survivors became adherents of Mattathias, *Ant.* xii. 6. 2. In the next, it is most probable that they belonged to the Chasid party. For the many survivors of this church in the wilderness, *Ant.* xii. 6. 2, as well as the Chasid party, 1 Macc. ii. 42, gave in their adhesion to Mattathias after, and, without doubt, owing to the massacre just mentioned. In 1 Macc. ii. 42 the Chasids join Mattathias just after the latter had resolved henceforth to fight in self-defence on the Sabbath—a new line of action adopted in consequence of the murder of their brethren, 1 Macc. ii. 41. In Josephus, *Ant.* xii. 6. 2, the only fresh adherents gained by Mattathias at this period are the survivors above mentioned. “These,” he says, “appointed Mattathias to be their ruler, and he taught them to fight on the Sabbath day.” Thus this massacre, which is the historical fact at the root of our text, contributed to two results. (1) It was the direct cause of a new line of action as to the legitimacy of defensive warfare on the Sabbath (1 Macc. ii. 40, 41; *Ant.* xii. 6. 2). (2) It secured for Mattathias and his party the temporary support of the Chasids (1 Macc. ii. 42; *Ant.* xii. 6. 2).

In addition to 1 Macc. ii. 29–38, which we have dealt with above, our author has drawn upon other materials such as we find in 2 Macc. vi. 18–vii., where we have an account of the martyrdom of Eleazar and of the mother and her seven sons under Antiochus. Thus ver. 6: “Let us die rather than transgress the commands of . . . the God of our fathers,” is obviously the same as 2 Macc. vii. 2: *ἐτοιμοὶ γὰρ ἀποθνήσκειν ἑσμέν ἢ παραβαλεῖν τοὺς πατρὸς νόμους*. This latter statement is reproduced in 4 Macc. ix. 1. For a similar expression of Eleazar’s feeling, see 2 Macc. vi. 19. Again, in ver. 7 the strong assurance that God will avenge the blood of His servants is likewise found in 2 Macc. vii. 14, 17, 19, 34–36. Finally, the visitation is called an “unclean” one, ver. 2. This epithet better than any other would describe the Antiochian persecution from a Jewish standpoint—their holy altar polluted with the sacrifice of unclean animals, the temple and its courts profaned by the indecencies of the Venus cult, and the faithful adherents of the law forced to eat swine’s flesh and to join in the Dionysiac revels.

This martyrdom of the mother and her seven sons was a very favourite subject both with Jew and Christian. It forms the theme of 4 Macc. It is alluded to in Heb. xi. 35, and Origen (*Exhortatio ad Martyrium*, 22–27; *Comment. in Epist. ad Rom.* iv. 10) and Cyprian (*ad Fortunatum*, xi., and *Testim.* iii. 17) recount it at length. It has been retold by Prudentius, *περὶ στε-*

φάνων x., and Marius Victorinus. Augustine was so fascinated with it that he thought (*de Civ. Dei*, xviii. 36) that the books of the Maccabees should on account of these chapters be regarded as canonical.

(b) But the character of this chapter appears to be not only historical, but also *parenetic*. *Its purpose is to indicate the line of action which the Chasids or Pharisaic party of his own time should pursue.* Thus he ignores the temporary coalition of the Chasids with Mattathias and Judas Maccabæus. This coalition lasted, as we know, but a few years. Very early the aims of the Maccabean party began to change with their successes in arms, and their strife, at first nothing more than a life and death struggle to maintain the faith of their fathers, soon resolved itself into a war for the independence of the nation. When this phase of the conflict appeared, the Chasids withdrew from all further share in it. Their attitude was quietistic. Their sole duty was to obey the law, and leave the rest to God. It is this conception of duty that is depicted in historical actuality. But the actual incident in our author's hands is more than an historical event. It is likewise a precedent and example for after ages. It prescribes the duty our author would enforce on the Pharisaism of his own time. *Just as his complete silence as to the Maccabean uprising forms an emphatic censure of its aims, so his vigorous statement of the opposed and Chasid line of action is designed as a*

commendation of its character. Thus while some of the Pharisaic party of his own time were seeking to give a political character to religion, and so to follow Maccabean precedents, others, as our author, were as vigorously upholding the old traditions of quietude and resignation, and while the former urged, "Let us war," the latter, with equal determination, rejoined: "Nay rather, let us die."

But let us return for a moment to the history of the Chasids after 164 B.C. When their coalition with Judas, which we have already mentioned, came to an end, they forsook so completely the field of political and public life, that they are practically unknown to history till the reign of J. Hyrcanus, when they reappear under their new name of Pharisees. This characteristic aversion of the Pharisees to patriotic aspirations began to disappear towards the close of the next century—a change that is in part attested by the Psalms of Solomon. About this time a fusion took place between their traditional doctrine of Law and popular Messianic beliefs, and thus the bulk of the Pharisaic party became committed to political interests and movements—the bulk, but not all; for some, like our author, clung to the old attitude of non-resistance. But he protested in vain. The leavening of Pharisaism with patriotism and earthly political ideas, and its corruption through success, went on apace, and became the fruitful mother of national disasters. These

culminated in the fall of Jerusalem.

1. *In that day there will be.* See crit. note.

A man of the tribe of Levi. The Chasid movement thus sprang from or was associated with the priestly tribe, according to our author. He was probably thinking of Eleazar, who, in 2 Macc. vi. 18, is called one of the principal scribes, and in 4 Macc. v. 3 a priest.

Whose name will be Taxo. We have here the crux of the book. Scholars have to no purpose wasted their ingenuity upon it. The various interpretations are as follows:—i. Hilgenfeld takes it = $\tau\acute{\alpha}\xi\omega$. Next, he suppresses the second letter, and supposes the last to be corrupt, and thus arrives at $\tau\acute{\xi}\gamma'$ = 363. But $\tau\acute{\xi}\gamma'$ (= the Messiah) = 363. Hence Taxo is the Messiah. It is needless to criticise this further than to add, that if it is allowable to change without some external documentary evidence two letters out of four, it is possible to make what we please out of anything.

ii. Volkmar takes it = $\tau\acute{\alpha}\xi\omega$, which, he assumes, was corrupted from $\tau\acute{\alpha}\xi\iota\omega$ = 431. But $\tau\acute{\alpha}\xi\iota\omega$ (Rabbi Aqiba) = 431. Hence Taxo is Rabbi Aqiba. But, unhappily for Volkmar, $\tau\acute{\alpha}\xi\iota\omega$ is an impossible form, and Aqiba was never written without the yod. There are further objections into which we need not enter.

These last two attempts at solution proceeded on the hypothesis of a Greek original; but if the original was Semitic, no interpretation arrived at on that hypothesis could in any

sense be right. Later scholars have essayed the problem on the hypothesis of a Semitic original.

iii. Colani (*Revue de Theologie*, iv. 1868, pp. 90-94) takes Taxo to be a corruption of $\tau\acute{\alpha}\xi\omega$, "ordaining" = $\tau\acute{\alpha}\xi\omega$. This last = 340. So also does $\tau\acute{\alpha}\xi\omega$ = 340. Hence R. Jehuda ben Baba is the great Taxo, "the ordainer," who, before he was slain in 137 A.D., ordained the seven last disciples of Aqiba as rabbis. At the close of this explanation Colani adds: "Tout cela, bien entendu, est un jeu, rien qu' un jeu"—and we agree with him; but his pleasantry is finer than the seriousness of his two predecessors.

iv. Carriere (*Revue de Theol.* iv. 1868, pp. 94-96), like his predecessor, believes in an Aramaic original. The words *cujus nomen erit Taxo* retranslated into Aramaic = $\tau\acute{\alpha}\xi\omega$, which is corrupt, for $\tau\acute{\alpha}\xi\omega$ = "who will promulgate a decree," i.e. trace a line of conduct. $\tau\acute{\alpha}\xi\omega$, which = "ordinance," etc., was wrongly taken to be a proper name by the Greek translator.

v. Hausrath (*Neutestamentl. Zeitgesch.* iv. p. 77, note) thinks that here by the method Ath Bash $\tau\acute{\alpha}\xi\omega$ was transposed into $\tau\acute{\alpha}\xi\iota\omega$. The Greek translator took the τ as σ . $\tau\acute{\alpha}\xi\iota\omega$ here is for the Messiah. We might say here with Colani in reference to Hilgenfeld's interpretation: "This passage has as much to do with the Messiah as with the Emperor Barbarossa."

Other attempts have been made on the hypothesis of a Hebrew original.

vi. Wieseler (*Jahr. f. d. Th.* 1868, p. 629; *ZDMG*, 1882, p. 193) thinks that that Taxo goes back to $\psi\eta\eta$, the badger-like one. This designation is to be explained from the pious having to dwell in the caves of the earth; cf. 2 Macc. x. 6: $\kappa\alpha\lambda\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \sigma\pi\eta\lambda\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \theta\eta\rho\iota\omega\eta\upsilon\ \tau\rho\acute{o}\pi\omicron\nu\ \eta\varsigma\alpha\nu\ \nu\epsilon\mu\acute{\upsilon}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$. Hilgenfeld remarks on this interpretation: Utinam melis Wieseleriana e spelunca sua nunquam prorep-
sisset.

vii. Rosenthal (*Vier Apoc. Bücher*, pp. 31, 32) adopts Hausrath's idea. He points out that $\psi\eta\eta$ is numerically equal to $\psi\eta\eta$, and thinks that in $\psi\eta\eta$, which, as Hausrath has suggested, corresponds to $\psi\eta\eta$, we have a mystical reference to a second Moses who was to rise again. He appeals to Deut. xviii. 18 in support of his contention.

None of these solutions is satisfactory. The person referred to is, as we have seen, not one living in the future, but one who was a contemporary of Judas the Maccabee. From the standpoint of this interpretation I offer the following suggestion. In the Samaritan "Legends of Moses," translated from the Arabic into German by Dr. Leitner (*Vierteljahrschrift f. deutsch - und englisch - Theol. Forschung*, iv. 1871, p. 210), the following passage occurs, which seems to be to some degree dependent on our text: "Angezeigt wurde dass ein Mann auferstehen würde 'Levi' und sein Name sollte sein 'Eiferer der Gemeinde,' und er die Ebräer und das Haus des Weines heil-

igen. Er würde in drei Tagen auferstehen ohne Recht." This passage appears to be very corrupt, and to be derived partly from our text, partly from N.T. history. The phrases "ein Mann . . . Levi" and "sein Name sollte sein 'Eiferer der Gemeinde'" seem to be drawn from our text. Hence we conjecture that in $\kappa\upsilon\iota\upsilon\varsigma\ \nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\ \epsilon\rho\iota\tau$ Taxo, which = $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\alpha\varsigma\ \psi\eta\eta\ \kappa\epsilon\kappa\alpha\varsigma$, the last word is corrupt for $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\alpha\varsigma$ = "the zealous." Hence the text will be, "A man of the tribe of Levi whose name will be the zealous one." This person will be zealous for the law only, and show his zeal by submitting to death rather than transgress the commandments. Cf. vers. 4, 6, 7. The writer regards the person here described as representing those who were truly zealous for the law, over against the Maccabean party who claimed to be so. Zeal for the law was the most conspicuous as well as the most essential characteristic of the religious movement which opposed Antiochus. Cf. the words of Mattathias, 1 Macc. ii. 27, $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \delta\ \zeta\eta\lambda\omega\nu\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\ \nu\acute{o}\mu\omega\ \kappa\alpha\lambda\ \iota\sigma\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu\ \delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\kappa\eta\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\lambda\theta\epsilon\tau\omega\ \delta\pi\iota\sigma\omega\ \mu\omicron\nu$. This comes out still more clearly in the words attributed to Mattathias in Joseph. Ant. xii. 6. 2, $\epsilon\iota\ \tau\iota\varsigma\ \zeta\eta\lambda\omega\tau\eta\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\nu\ \pi\alpha\tau\rho\iota\omega\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\theta\tilde{\omega}\nu\ \kappa\alpha\lambda\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\tilde{\upsilon}\ \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\rho\eta\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\alpha\varsigma\ ,\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\sigma\theta\omega\ ,\ \phi\eta\sigma\iota\nu\ ,\ \acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\iota$; also in his address to his sons, 1 Macc. ii. 50, $\kappa\alpha\lambda\ \nu\tilde{\upsilon}\nu\ ,\ \tau\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\nu\alpha\ ,\ \zeta\eta\lambda\acute{\omega}\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\ \nu\acute{o}\mu\omega\ \kappa\alpha\lambda\ \delta\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \tilde{\upsilon}\mu\tilde{\omega}\nu\ \tilde{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho\ \delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\kappa\eta\varsigma\ \pi\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\nu\ \tilde{\upsilon}\mu\tilde{\omega}\nu$.

Seven sons. The reference here can only be to the seven sons of the widow in 2 Macc.

tribe of Levi, whose name will be Taxo, who having seven sons will speak to them exhorting (them): 2. "Observe, my sons, behold a second ruthless (and) unclean visitation has come upon the people, and a punishment merciless and far exceeding the first. 3. For what nation or what region or what people of those who are impious towards the Lord, who have done many abominations, have suffered as great calamities as have befallen us? 4. Now therefore, my sons, hear me: for observe and know that neither did (our) fathers nor their forefathers tempt God, so as to transgress His commands. 5. And ye know that this is our strength, and thus we will do. 6. Let us fast for the space of three

vii. and 4 Macc. See notes on p. 33.

2. *Second unclean visitation.* The first has been described in III., which they endured at the hands of Nebuchadnezzar; the second is that which they suffer under Antiochus. This latter "far exceeds the first," the writer proceeds to say. Why this visitation was called unclean we have shown above in the notes on p. 33.

3. *What nation, etc.* We might compare Josephus' words in reference to the sufferings of the Jews during the wars between Ptolemy Philopator and Antiochus Epiphanes, *Ant.* xii. 3. 3.

4. *Neither did (our) parents nor their forefathers tempt God.* See crit. note. This absence of the sense of demerit appears

in many of the Psalms. Our author must have supposed that a faithful remnant had existed at all times.

To transgress His commands. Cf. ver. 6.

5. *And this we will do, i.e.* as our fathers.

6. *Fast.* Cf. Dan. vi. 18, ix. 3; Apoc. Bar. v. 7, ix. 2, xii. 5, xxi. 1, xlvii. 2; 4 Ezra v. 20, vi. 35, ix. 26, 27, xii. 51.

Let us go into a cave in the field. When the persecution became severe in B.C. 168, 167, those who still clung to the law took refuge in caves, 1 Macc. i. 53, *ἐν κρυφίοις*. These hiding-places are described in 1 Macc. ii. 31 as "secret places in the wilderness" (*κατέβησαν . . . εἰς τοὺς κρυφούς ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ*)—a very close parallel to the phrase in

days and on the fourth let us go into a cave which is in the field, and let us die rather than transgress the commands of the Lord of lords, the God of our fathers. 7. For if we do this and die, our blood will be avenged before the Lord.

X. And then His kingdom will appear throughout all His creation,

our text. Cf. also 1 Macc. ii. 36, 41. Those who were zealous for the law fled with their wives and children, and finding concealment in these caves lived there, Joseph. *Ant.* xii. 6. 2: μετὰ τῶν τέκνων καὶ γυναικῶν ἔφυγον εἰς τὴν ἔρημον καὶ ἐν τοῖς σπηλαίοις διήγον. Heb. xi. 38 points to this period. In these also they observed the religious festivals, 2 Macc. x. 6: μετ' εὐφροσύνης ἦγον ἡμέρας ὅκτω . . . μνημονεύοντες ὡς πρὸ μικροῦ χρόνου τὴν τῶν σκηνῶν ἑορτὴν . . . ἐν τοῖς σπηλαίοις . . . ἦσαν νεμόμενοι. But these hiding-places were betrayed to the Syro-Macedonian governor, and many Jews slain or burnt, 2 Macc. vi. 11: ἕτεροι δὲ πλεονόντες συνδραμόντες εἰς τὰ σπήλαια λεληθότως ἄγειν τὴν ἐβδομάδα, μνηστέντες τῷ Φιλίππῳ συνεφλογίσθησαν, διὰ τὸ εὐλαβῶς ἔχειν βροθῆσαι ἑαυτοῖς κατὰ δόξαν τῆς σεμνοτάτης ἡμέρας.

Let us die rather than transgress, etc. As their fathers had been faithful to the law, Taxo and his seven sons are resolved to be so likewise, lest they transgress the commands of their fathers' God. The expression, "let us die rather than transgress," etc., appears to have

originated with the persecution of Antiochus. It gives a characteristic and true note of the temper of the persecuted. It stereotypes the attitude of the faithful, as well of those who endured death passively as of those who rushed to arms in defence of their religion. These words are almost exactly those that were used by one of the seven martyrs in 2 Macc. vii. 2: ἔτοιμοι γὰρ ἀποθνήσκειν ἐσμὲν ἢ πατῶν νόμους παραβαίνειν. Cf. 4 Macc. ix. 1. They are essentially the same as those uttered by the 1000 that were martyred in the wilderness, 1 Macc. ii. 37: ἀποθάνωμεν οἱ πάντες ἐν τῇ ἀπλότητι ἡμῶν. Their thought is echoed in Mattathias' address to his children, *Ant.* xii. 6. 1: κρεῖττον αὐτοῖς εἶναι ὑπὲρ τῶν πατρίων νόμων ἀποθανεῖν ἢ ζῆν οὕτως ἀδόξως; and the resolve they express is ascribed also to the martyred Eleazar, 2 Macc. vi. 19.

7. *Our blood will be avenged, etc.* This assurance that God will avenge is frequently found in the history of the seven martyred brethren, 2 Macc. vi. 14, 17, 19, 31, 35-37.

X. 1-10. These verses form

And then Satan will be no more,
And sorrow will depart with him.

2. Then the hands of the angel will be filled
And he will be appointed chief,
And he will forthwith avenge them of their
enemies.

a hymn of ten stanzas of three lines each. It falls into three sections. The first constitutes the introduction, and consists of two stanzas. The second and third consist of four stanzas each. The two last sections open with words almost identical. It will be observed that every stanza has a triple movement or parallelism—at all events, the greater number. This fact makes it highly probable that where this triple parallelism is not observed the error is due to corruption of the text. The error may be of the nature either of defect or redundancy. Thus vers. 3 and 9 are defective in this respect, and 4, 5, 10 may be redundant. If there are redundancies in these verses, they may be due to duplicate renderings or incorporated marginal glosses.

Schmidt-Merx are of opinion that the hymn begins with ver. 3, and is therefore only of eight stanzas. They regard the enim in ver. 3 as=י introductory. They point out that the subject of ver. 3 is "God," but that "angel" is the subject in ver. 2. Hence they suppose that the hymn is of earlier and different authorship than the rest of the book.

There are grounds for differen-

tiating 1, 2 and 3-10 other than those mentioned by Schmidt-Merx, as will appear below.

1. *His kingdom will appear*, etc. This seems to promise a new heaven and a new earth, but this is not the case if ver. 10a is right.

Satan will be no more. Does Satan mean here the head of the kingdom of evil or the adversary of Israel? The following line makes for the former view.

Sorrow, etc. Cf. Isa. xxxv. 10; Rev. xxi. 4.

2. *The hands of the angel will be filled*, i.e. the angel will be delegated, appointed. The phrase מלא= "to fill one's hand" means, to deliver the priesthood to him. Cf. Exod. xxviii. 41, xxix. 9; Lev. xxi. 10; Test. Lev. 8, ἐπλήρωσαν τὰς χεῖράς μου θυμιάματος ὥστε ἱερατεῦν με; Job xxxii. 3.

The angel, i.e. Michael the patron saint of Israel. Cf. Dan. xii. 1.

And he will be appointed chief. Michael will lead Israel. The text, qui est in summo constitutus= "who is placed supreme," or "appointed chief," cannot be right. This clause, as it stands, is a mere epithet of "angel" (nuntii) in the preceding line,

3. For the Heavenly One will arise from His royal throne,

And He will go forth from His holy habitation
And His wrath will burn on account of
His sons.

4. And the earth will tremble: to its confines
will it be shaken:

And the high mountains will be made low
And the hills will be shaken and fall.

whereas the parallelism requires, in the second line, the statement of a fresh fact which will modify or develop the statement which appears in the first line. Hence for est I have read erit and taken qui=וְהָיָה, as in I. 6. In summo = לראש or בראש, or something equivalent.

And he will . . . avenge, etc. Michael will avenge Israel. But since Michael is not so much as once referred to again in this hymn, and as it is God Himself that destroys the Gentiles and avenges Israel (vers. 7, 8), it is probable that 1, 2, and 3-10 are not from the same author. This conclusion gains confirmation if we compare the picture of perfect goodness and perfect happiness throughout all creation depicted in ver. 1, and compare it with vers. 4-6, and particularly with ver. 10, if the text is there right. Vers. 3-10 are, I believe, native to the text, but not 1, 2.

3-6. Second section. Signs which will accompany God's coming.

3. *The Heavenly One*. This

designation belongs to our author. Cf. II. 4, IV. 4.

From His royal throne. The Latin a sede regni sui=מִן כִּסֵּא מַלְכוּתוֹ. Cf. Dan. v. 20.

He will go forth, etc. Mic. i. 3; Isa. xxvi. 21; Eth. En. i. 3.

From His holy habitation. Deut. xxvi. 15; Isa. lxiii. 15.

And His wrath will burn. The text is here cum indignationem et iram. But the parallelism requires a finite sentence, and not an adverbial phrase depending on "will go forth." The corruption seems to have arisen in the Greek. Cum indignatione et ira=ἐν θυμῷ τε καὶ ὀργῇ, which I take to be a corruption of καὶ θυμῷσεται ὀργῇ=וְהָרָה אָפוּ, "and His wrath will burn." The text as it stands=בְּהָרִיק וְאָף, "with indignation and wrath."

4. *And the high mountains will be made low*. Isa. xl. 4; Eth. En. i. 6.

And the hills will be shaken and fall. The text, which was corrupt, I have emended by means of Eth. En. i. 6 (Greek Version). See crit. note.

5. And the horns of the sun will be broken
and he will be turned into darkness;
And the moon will not give her light, and
be turned wholly into blood.
And the circle of the stars will be disturbed.
6. And the sea will retire into the abyss,
And the fountains of waters will fail,
And the rivers will dry up.
7. For the Most High will arise, the Eternal
God alone,
And He will appear to punish the Gentiles,
And He will destroy all their idols.

5. *And the horns of the sun . . . into blood.* On this restoration of the text see crit. notes (pp. 86, 87), where the parallel passages from the O.T. and the N.T. are cited.

Circle of the stars will be disturbed. Cf. Mark xiii. 25.

Fountains . . . fail. Cf. Pss. Sol. xvii. 21, *πηγαὶ συνεσχέθησαν αἰῶνιοι*; Test. Levi 4, *יְדָאוֹן הַמַּיִם הַחַיִּים*; 4 Ezra vi. 24, *et venae fontium stabunt*.

Fountains . . . and rivers. For this collocation, cf. Rev. viii. 10, xvi. 4.

7-10. Third section. God punishes the Gentiles, destroys their idols, makes Israel to triumph over Rome, and exalts them finally to heaven.

7. *The Most High will arise.* Cf. ver. 3, "The Heavenly One will arise."

The Eternal God. Previous

editors have wrongly connected Summus and Deus. Ver. 3 shows that Summus here, as Coelestis there, are to be taken by themselves. Deus aeternus, moreover, is in all probability derived from Deut. xxxiii. 27, *אלהי קרם*, as 8a certainly is from ver. 29 of the same chapter, and 8b probably from the same verse.

Alone. The text solus=*לברו*. The meaning seems to be: God alone will come to punish the Gentiles and exalt Israel, and not a Messiah. This is said more clearly in 4 Ezra, where, to the question in v. 56, *Demonstra servo tuo per quem visitas creaturam tuam?* God answers in vi. 6, *Finis per me et non per alium*. Thus this forms another argument against 1, 2 and 3-10 being from one and the same author.

8. Then thou, O Israel, wilt be happy,
 And thou wilt mount upon the neck[s and
 wings] of the eagle,
 And (the days of thy mourning) will be ended.
 9. And God will exalt thee,

8. Israel's triumph over its enemies in this world.

Then thou, O Israel, wilt be happy. This is taken directly from Deut. xxxiii. 29.

Thou wilt mount upon the necks and. If the text is right, it recalls Deut. xxxiii. 29, על-במותי חריך, and gives the interpretation of that verse that was current for some time before and long after the Christian era. Thus, whereas modern scholars render "Thou shalt tread upon their high places," the LXX., Syr., Vulg., Targ.-Onk., Targ.-Jon., Jarchi translated "Thou shalt tread upon their necks," or "neck." This rendering was probably due to Joshua x. 24, "Put your feet upon the necks of these kings." Our text recalls Deut. xxxiii. 29, but does not agree exactly with it or any of the Versions. In Bar. iv. 26, ἐπὶ τραχήλους αἰτῶν ἐπιβήσῃ is derived directly from it. If our text is trustworthy, the reference is clearly to Israel's triumph over Rome. The plural "necks" ought in that case to be written "neck"; for צוֹמֵרִים, from which it is derived, can, according to Hebrew usage, be rendered singular or plural as the context requires. But it is not at all impossible that the text is corrupt, and that it ran originally, תעלה על-כנפי נשרים, "thou wilt

mount on the wings of eagles," and was derived from Isa. xl. 31. So the Targ.-Jon. interprets Isa. xl. 31. סליק על נרפי נשרין. Thus cervices et would be a later interpolation. This figure of Israel "mounting on eagles' wings" would harmonise well with the exalted tone of the passage. If this be so, there is, of course, no reference to Rome in the text.

The days of thy mourning. So the lacuna is supplied by Dr. Cheyne. See crit. note.

On the vision of the three-headed eagle with many wings, see 4 Ezra xi.-xii.

9. Israel's exaltation to eternal blessedness in heaven.

Cause thee to approach the heaven of the stars. This language might be metaphorical. For other examples, cf. Pss. Sol. i. 5, ὑψώθησαν ἕως τῶν ἀστέρων; Jer. li. (LXX., xxviii.) 9, ἐξῆλθεν ἕως τῶν ἀστέρων. Instead of "the heaven of the stars" we have "the stars of heaven" in Isa. xiv. 13 (LXX.), ἐπάνω τῶν ἀστέρων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (כוכבי אל) θήσω γὼν θρόνον μου. These "stars of God" ("of heaven," LXX.) are rendered by the Targ.-Jon. in this passage by "the people of God," and thus regarded as a metaphor.

But the language seems not to be metaphorical, but to relate to Israel transfigured and glorified

And He will cause thee to approach to the
heaven of the stars,

And He will establish thy habitation among
them.

10. And thou wilt look from on high and wilt
see thy enemies in Ge(henna),

And thou wilt recognise them and rejoice,

And thou wilt give thanks and confess thy
Creator.

after the final judgment—to Israel not in the body, but in the spirit. In this case we should compare Eth. En. civ. 2, “Ye will shine as the stars of heaven, . . . and the portals of heaven will be opened to you”; civ. 6, “Ye will become companions of the hosts of heaven.” The words, “Thou wilt see thy enemies in Ge(henna),” in the next verse favour this interpretation.

And He will establish thy habitation among them. The text is here, loco habitationis corum = מושבם במקום, and is beyond question corrupt; for (1) the parallelism is wanting, and (2) we expect here a statement as to the place of Israel’s habitation and not that of the stars. Hence we regard מושבם = “their habitation” as defective for מושבך בם = “thy habitation among them,” the בך being omitted owing to the copyist’s eye passing from the first ב to the second. In the next place, במקום = loco, is, as the structure of the rest of the stanza shows, a corruption of some transitive

verb preceded by vav,—I take it to be of וחקים = “and He will establish.” Hence the above text. Cf. Eth. En. civ. 2, 4, 6.

10. *See thy enemies in Ge(henna)* = videbis inimicos tuos in Ge(henna). So I emend and restore the corrupt text vides inimicos tuos in terram. Previous editors have merely changed this text into videbis inimicos tuos in terra. But the sense thus arrived at is impossible. If the words in terram are not corrupt, it is difficult to take them otherwise than literally; but if we do so, how are we to explain them? If Israel’s enemies are on the earth, and Israel beholds them from on high, then Israel must be already in heaven. But that could only be after the final judgment, and after that event the enemies of Israel could no longer be upon earth. Hence we must take the phrase “on the earth” metaphorically, or regard it as corrupt. But to take it metaphorically as “in the depths” is not possible. Hence it is corrupt, or rather,

11. And do thou, Joshua (the son of) Nun, keep these words and this book; 12. For from my death—(my) assumption—until His advent there will be CCL times. 13. And this is their course

defective. The context points to Israel's enemies being in torments; for Israel rejoices over the plight of the latter. They are, moreover, in sight of Israel. These two facts at once suggest the thought of Gehenna here, and that the original was בני הנם. But בני הנם was lost and rendered ἐν γῆ, and this in turn by in terram. בני בני-הנם is twice rendered ἐν γῆ *Beenbū* in 2 Chron. xxviii. 3 and in xxxiii. 6. γῆ or γαί is likewise merely ארץ or ʾ translated in Josh. xviii. 16; 1 Sam. xiii. 18; 1 Chron. iv. 14; 2 Chron. xxxiii. 6; Ezek. xxxix. 11, 15; Eth. En. xxvii. 2.

Hence I take the true text to be, "Thou wilt see thy enemies in Gehenna, and thou wilt recognise them and rejoice." This portrays faithfully the expectations of the Jews as to the future life. In early times (Isa. lxvi. 24; Eth. En. xxvii. 2, 3, liv. 1, 2, xc. 26, 27) Gehenna was regarded as the place of punishment for faithless Jews, who should there suffer in the presence of the righteous; but in N.T. times it had become the future abode of the wicked generally, who were to be tormented within view of the blessed. Cf. 4 Ezra vii. 36, Et apparebit locus tormenti, et contra illum erit locus requie-tionis; clibanus gehennae ostendetur, et contra eum jucunditatis paradisi.

Recognise them, etc. If both Israel and their enemies were on earth, and Israel had just triumphed over the latter, this statement would be absurd. But if they are respectively in heaven and gehenna, the recognition is full of point, and just cause for rejoicing.

11. *This book*. Cf. I. 16, XI. 1.

12. *My death* — (*my*) *assumption*. The word "assumption" was not in the original here, which told only of Moses' death. Cf. ver. 14 and I. 15. It was introduced by the final editor, who combined in one work the two distinct books, "The Testament of Moses" and "The Assumption of Moses." Our present book is what survives of "The Testament of Moses," which knew nothing of Moses' "Assumption."

His Advent, i.e. God's advent for judgment.

CCL times. Each "time" = 7 years, or a year-week. Thus 250 times = 1750 years. Hence from the creation (see I. 2) to the final judgment was to be a period of 4250 years, or 85 jubilees. This estimate is found elsewhere, I think, only in Sanhedrin 97b; but there the goal is the coming of the Messiah.

14. *I shall go to sleep*, etc. Moses here looks forward to an ordinary death, and to joining his fathers in Sheol, as also in I. 15 (see note) and X. 12 (note).

which they will pursue till they are consummated. 14. And I shall go to sleep with my fathers. 15. Wherefore, Joshua thou (son of) Nun, (be strong and) be of a good courage; (for) God hath chosen (thee) to be my successor in the same covenant.

XI. And when Joshua had heard the words of Moses that were written in his writing as well as all that he had before said, he rent his clothes and cast himself at Moses' feet. 2. And Moses comforted him and wept with him. 3. And Joshua answered him and said: 4. "Why dost thou comfort me, (my) lord Moses? And how shall I be comforted in regard to that which thou hast spoken the bitter word which has gone forth from thy mouth, which is full of tears and lamentation, in that thou departest from this people? 5. And now what place will receive thee? 6. Or what will be the sign that marks (thy) sepulchre? 7. Or

In XI. 4, 9 also, an ordinary death seems to be implied.

15. (*Be strong and*) *be of a good courage.* See crit. note.

Successor. See I. 7, note. Joshua is the prophet promised in Deut. xviii. 15, according to our author. Thus no Messianic interpretation is here given to this passage by the Jews.

XI. 1. *His writing.* Cf. I. 16, X. 11.

4. *Comfort me . . . be comforted?* See crit. note.

Departest from this people. Cf. Apoc. Bar. xxxiii. 3, lxxvii. 12, for similar lamenta-

tions on Baruch's departure. See also 4 Ezra xii. 44. The word "depart" is used in Apoc. Bar. xiv. 19, xv. 1, xliii. 2, etc., in the sense of dying an ordinary death. That seems to be implied here, and in ver. 9 also.

5-8. No single locality is worthy enough to become the place of Moses' burial. The whole earth is his sepulchre.

7. Baldensperger thinks that this verse is directed polemically against the Christians, since the body of Christ was moved from the cross to the sepulchre.

who will dare to move thy body from thence as a man from place to place? 8. For all men when they die have according to their age their sepulchres on earth; but thy sepulchre is from the rising to the setting sun, and from the south to the confines of the north: all the world is thy sepulchre. 9. My lord, thou art departing, and who will feed this people? 10. Or who is there that will have compassion on them and who will be their guide by the way? 11. Or who will pray for them, not omitting a single day, in order that I may lead them into the land of (their) forefathers? 12. How therefore am I to control this people as a father (his) only son, or as a mistress (her) virgin daughter, who is being prepared to be handed over to the husband she will revere, while she guards her person from the sun and (takes care) that her feet are not unshod for running upon the ground.

8. *All the world is thy sepulchre.* The original of these words is, as Rönsch recognised, to be found in Thuc. ii. 43, ἀνδρῶν γὰρ ἐπιφανῶν πᾶσα γῆ τάφος. As with a very slight change these words become Greek iambics, it is possible that they were popular expressions, and thus reached Palestine as did those of Aratus, Menander, and Epimenides. Cf. Acts xvii. 23; 1 Cor. xv. 33; Tit. i. 12.

11. *Who will pray for him.* See XII. 6.

Not omitting. The text is nec patiens; but here, as frequently

elsewhere, we must translate not the text but the Hebrew, or, as it is here, the Greek presupposed by the text, οὐδὲ παύειν. See crit. note.

12. *Am I to control this people.* See crit. note.

Or as a mistress her virgin daughter. See crit. note.

To be given to the husband. See crit. note, where also parallels from Ecclus. will be found. *She will revere.* See crit. note and parallels from Ecclus. (p. 93). *Guarding her person.* Cf. Ecclus. vii. 24, θυγατέρες σοί εἰσι; πρόσσεχε τῷ σώματι αὐτῶν.

13. And how shall I supply them with food and drink according to the pleasure of their will? 14. For of them there will be 600,000 men, for these have multiplied to this degree through thy prayers, (my) lord Moses. 15. And what wisdom or understanding have I that I should judge or answer by word in the house of the Lord? 16. And the kings of the Amorites also will then be emboldened to attack us; (and) believing that there is no longer amongst them the sacred spirit who was worthy of the Lord, manifold and incomprehensible, the lord of the word, who was faithful in all things, God's chief prophet throughout the earth, the most perfect teacher in the world, (yea) that he is no longer among them, they will say: 'Let us go against them. 17. If the enemy have but once wrought

13. See crit. note.

14. 600,000 men. See crit. note. Cf. Exod. xii. 37.

Through thy prayers. The text is, in tuis orationibus. The in = ἐν = εἰς.

16. *That there is no longer amongst them.* See crit. note.

Sacred spirit . . . manifold. Cf. Wisd. vii. 22, πνεῦμα . . . ἅγιον . . . πολυμερές.

Worthy of the Lord. Cf. Wisd. iii. 5, ὁ θεὸς ἐπέβρασε αὐτοὺς καὶ εὐρεν αὐτοὺς ἁγίου εἶναι.

Lord of the word. I cannot suggest the origin of this phrase.

Faithful in all things. Cf. Num. xii. 7, "Moses . . . was faithful in all Thy house"; Heb. iii. 2.

God's chief prophet throughout the earth. The text is divinum per orbem terrarum profetem. A Hebrew superlative underlies this phrase. It = τὸν θεῖον διὰ τοῦ κόσμου προφήτην = נביא האלהים בארץ = "the prophet of God," etc.

The most perfect teacher in the world. The text is: consummation in saeculo doctorem—another Hebrew superlative = המורה החמים בעולם.

17. *No advocate to offer prayers, etc.* Cf. ver. 14. This office of praying on behalf of Israel is frequently ascribed to Jeremiah. Cf. 2 Macc. xv. 14, where Jeremiah appeared along with Onias in a vision to Judas

impiously against their Lord, they have no advocate to offer prayers on their behalf to the Lord, as did Moses the great messenger, who every hour day and night had his knees fixed to the earth, praying and looking for help to Him that ruleth all the world with compassion and righteousness, calling to mind the covenant of the fathers and propitiating the Lord with the oath.' 18. For they will say: 'He is not with them: let us go therefore and destroy them from off the face of the earth.' 19. What will then become of this people, my lord Moses?"

XII. And when Joshua had finished (these) words, he cast himself again at the feet of Moses. 2. And Moses took his hand and raised him into the seat before him, and answered and said unto him: 3. "Joshua do not despise thyself, but set thy mind at ease, and hearken to my words. 4.

Maccabaeus, and is described by the latter as: οὗτός ἐστι ὁ πολλὰ προσευχόμενος περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀγίας πόλεως Ἱερουσαλὴμ τοῦ θεοῦ προφήτης. Rest of words of Baruch ii. 3, ὅταν ἡμάρτανεν ὁ λαὸς . . . ὁ Ἱερουσαλὴμ . . . ἤρχετο ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ, ἕως ἂν ἀφέθῃ αὐτῷ ἡ ἁμαρτία. See also Apoc. Bar. ii. 2, and the Talmudic passages cited in the notes.

Looking for help to Him that ruleth all the earth. See crit. note on this difficult passage, where also parallels are given.

XII. 2. *Took his hand and raised him into the seat before him.* This verse refers to the

installation of Joshua in Moses' place. Cf. Sifri Piska 140 on Num. xxvii. 28: "Give Joshua a teacher that in thy lifetime he may question, expound, give judgment, lest after thy death the Israelites may say: 'During the lifetime of his teacher he did not give judgment, but now he does.' Thereupon (Moses) raised him (Joshua) from the ground and placed him beside himself on the chair." Quoted by Heidenheim, *Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift*, 1871, p. 102.

4. Both the Gentile and the Israelite are the work of God's hands. The destinies likewise

All the nations which are in the earth God hath created as He hath us, He hath foreseen them and us from the beginning of the creation of the earth unto the end of the age, and nothing has been neglected by Him even to the least thing, but all things He hath foreseen and caused all to come forth. 5. (Yea) all things which are to be in this earth the Lord hath foreseen and lo! they are brought forward (into the light 6.

of both are of His making. Whatever befalls—whether of disaster to Israel or exaltation to the Gentile—has been foreseen even to the smallest detail, and nothing can set at nought or hinder God's original purpose in creation; for the world was created on Israel's behalf, I. 12. However glorious the fortunes of the Gentile and depressed those of the Jew, there is no reason for downheartedness or despair (see ver. 3),—God's purpose standeth sure, and will ultimately assert itself.

Foreseen and caused to come forth. See crit. note.

6. *Appointed me to pray for their sins.* This was a genuinely Jewish conception, and not borrowed from Christianity. Thus, as we have already seen in the note on XI. 17, Jeremiah was held to discharge this office in the spiritual world, 2 Macc. xv. 14. Enoch also (Slav. En. (MSS. AB) lxiv. 5) was conceived of as "one removes the sins of men." Philo speaks of the intercessions and prayers offered

on behalf of Israel by the righteous forefathers of the nation: these intercessions of the departed saints of Israel were to be the second of the three chief means for the restoration of their descendants, *De Execrat.* ix. (ii. 436): *τρισιχρησόμενοι παρακλήτοις τῶν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα καταλλαγῶν . . . δευτέρῳ δὲ τῇ τῶν ἀρχηγέτων τοῦ ἔθνους ὁσιότητι, ὅτι ταῖς ἀφειμέναις σωμάτων ψυχαῖς ἀπλαστον καὶ γυμνὴν ἐπιδεικνυμένας πρὸς τὸν ἄρχοντα θεραπείαν τὰς ὑπὲρ υἱῶν καὶ θυγατέρων ἱκετείας οὐκ ἀτελεῖς εἰώθασι ποιεῖσθαι, γέρας αὐτοῖς παρέχοντος τοῦ πατρὸς τὸ ἐπήκουον ἐν εὐχαῖς.* In Joseph. *Ant.* i. 13. 3, Abraham is described as saying to Isaac, when on the point of sacrificing him: *μετ' εὐχῶν δὲ καὶ λειτουργίας ἐκείνου τὴν ψυχὴν τὴν σὴν προσδεξιμένου καὶ παρ' αὐτῷ καθέξοντος ἔσθ' μοι εἰς κηδεμόνα καὶ γηροκόμον.* In the Slav. En. liii. 1 this doctrine is denied. See my note *in loc.*, where a history of this doctrine is sketched briefly.

The Lord) hath on their behalf appointed me to pray for their sins and make intercession for them. 7. For not for any virtue or strength of mine, but in His compassion and longsuffering was He pleased to call me. 8. For I say unto you, Joshua: it is not on account of the godliness of this people that thou shalt root out the nations. 9. The lights of the heaven, the foundations of the earth have been made and approved by God and are under the signet ring of His right hand. 10. Those, therefore, who do and fulfil the commandments of God will increase and be prospered: 11. But those who sin and set at nought the commandments will be without the blessings before mentioned, and they will be punished with many torments by the nations. 12. But wholly to root out and destroy

7. *For not for any virtue, etc. . . . was He pleased to call me.* See crit. notes. Just as in Rom. ix. 11, 12, the selection of Jacob rather than Esau is declared to be due not to works, but to the divine purpose, so also here. This election is an election to privilege and not to eternal life. As regards the latter, it is written in the Tanchuma Pikkude 3, God does not determine beforehand whether a man shall be righteous or wicked, but puts this in the hands of the man only. See Slav. En. xxx. 15, note.

8. *Not on account of the*

godliness of the people, etc. Cf. Ezek. xxxvi. 22, 32. By a writer who so frankly recognises the wickedness of his nation and its need of frequent chastisement, its selection as the people of God could not well be ascribed to its merits, but must be traced back to the divine purpose. And yet he holds that the world was created on behalf of Israel, i. 12; and in xii. 4, 5, 13, it is God's foreknowledge, and not His pre-determining purpose, that is dwelt upon.

9. See crit. notes.

12. *Destroy.* See crit. note.

them is not permitted. 13. For God will go forth who has foreseen all things for ever, and His covenant has been established and the oath which . . .

ASSUMPTIONIS MOYSI FRAGMENTA



THE LATIN VERSION OF THE ASSUMPTION OF MOSES
CRITICALLY REVISED AND EMENDED

TOGETHER WITH

THE UNEMENDED LATIN TEXT OF THE SIXTH
CENTURY MS. IN THE MILAN LIBRARY

ASSUMPTIONIS MOYSI FRAGMENTA

THE LATIN VERSION OF THE ASSUMPTION OF MOSES CRITICALLY REVISED AND EMENDED

*Words included within round brackets () are supplied by the Editor ; words within square brackets [] are to be regarded as interpolations. When the text is corrupt, but the corruption is not native to the Latin but to the Greek or the Hebrew, then the text is corrected accordingly, and attention is drawn to the correction by an asterisk * placed in the margin.*

I. (Et factum est anno aetatis Moysi centesimo et vigesimo), 2. Qui est bis millesimus et quingentesimus annus a creatura orbis terrae, [3. nam secus qui in oriente sunt numerus . . . mus et . . . mus et mus profectionis fynicis. 4. Cum exivit plebs post profectionem quae fiebat per Moysen usque Amman trans Jordanem, 5. profetiae quae facta est a moysen in libro deutero-

I. 1. This verse, which is wanting in the MS., is supplied as above, cf. Deut. xxxi. 2, by Schmidt-Merx, save that I have written Moysi instead of Mosis, as this is the form of the genitive used by the Latin translator; by Hilgenfeld: Assumptio Moysis quae facta est anno vitae ejus Cmo et XXmo; by Volkmar: Liber profetiae Moysis, quem scripsit año aetatis centesimo

vicesimo; by Rönisch: Liber receptionis Moysi factae anno vitae ejus Cmo et XXmo.

3. With Volkmar and Schmidt-Merx I have omitted nam secus mus as a marginal gloss. Such a remark is impossible in a book of Hebrew or Aramaic origin. *Profectionis fynicis* are also to be omitted with Volkmar, though Schmidt-Merx retain them, inserting before them the

ASSUMPTIONIS MOYSI FRAGMENTA



TEXT OF THE SIXTH CENTURY LATIN MS. IN THE MILAN LIBRARY

The figures in clarendon in the margin denote the folio in the MS., and the letters a and b in the margin denote respectively the beginning of the first and second columns in a folio.

112 ^a	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	...	mus' et' .. mus
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	et'	mus' profec
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	4	tionis fynicis' cum
2	qui	est	bis	millesi					exivit plebs post
	mus	et	quingente						profectionem quae
	simus	annus	a	crea					fiebat per mosysen
	tura	orbis	terrae						usque amman trans
3	nam	secus	qui	in	ori			5	jordanem profetiae
	ente	sunt	numerus						quae facta est a moy

word quadragesimo. Hilgenfeld, who holds the book to be of Greek origin, regards the entire verse as genuine and restores as follows: nam secus qui in oriente sunt numeros [MM] mus et [CC] mus et [XXXXX] mus profectionis phoenicis. Rönsch *Z.f. W.T.* 1874, p. 556, regards qui est bis cum exivit plebs as a parenthesis and thus restores ver. 3: nam secus qui in oriente sunt numeros MM mus et

DCCL mus, et CCLV mus profectionis Phoenices.

4. I have bracketed this verse as an interpretation. Moses could not have spoken of Amman as across the Jordan: only a dweller in Jerusalem could have so described it.

5. Schmidt-Merx rightly reject this verse as a gloss. In a book of Hebrew origin the phrase libro Deuteronomio could not have been original.

nomio], 6. Qui vocavit ad se Iesum filium Nave, hominem probatum Domino, 7. Ut sit successor plebi et scene testimonii cum omnibus sanctis illius, 8. Et ut inducat plebem in terram datam patribus eorum, 9. Ut detur illis per testamentum et per iurandum, quod locutus est in scenae dare de Iesum dicendo ad Iesum verbum hoc: 10. "(Confortare) et
* firma te secus industriam tuam omnia quae mandata

6. *Qui* = מִי. Cf. III. 14; X. 2; see Introd., p. xxxiii. *Iesum filium Nave*, i.e. Ἰησοῦν υἱὸν Ναυή. This shows that the Latin was derived directly from the Greek. If it had been directly from the Hebrew, these words would have been Josue filium Nun.

7. *Ut sit successor plebi* = ἵνα εἴη διάδοχος τῷ λαῷ. What is the meaning of διάδοχος? It cannot mean "a successor" here, as Schmidt-Merx recognise when they propose successor (sibi et antecessor). But there is no need of such a violent remedy. διάδοχος means also (1) a court official of the second rank in the Egyptian papyri (see Steph. Thesaurus); (2) the chief minister of the king: LXX. ; 1 Chron. xviii. 17; 2 Chron. xxvi. 11, xxviii. 7; Ecclus. xlvi. 1. This meaning is found in Joseph. *Ant.* xv. 10, and is frequent in Philo. And this is exactly what the context requires: "that he might be the minister of the people." We have now to discover the Hebrew behind διάδοχος. This we learn from Ecclus. xlvi. 1, where it is a rendering of מִשְׁכָּן. This word

often means the chief minister or servant: thus in Exod. xxiv. 13; xxxiii. 11; Num. xi. 28; Josh. i. 1, Joshua is described *par excellence* as Moses' servant, כֹּשֶׁר מֹשֶׁה. It is also used of service in the tabernacle; cf. Num. viii. 26, etc. Hence the text = לְהִיט כֹּשֶׁר הָעָם. In x. 15 the same meaning is to be followed. It is, of course, possible that διάδοχος here may represent ψ, as in 2 Chron. xxvi. 11. But this would not differ materially from the sense we have reached above.

8. I read *et ut* instead of *ut et*, and *patribus* instead of *ex tribus*, with Schmidt-Merx.

9. After *illis* Schmidt-Merx adds *ut deus illis*, and for *quod* read *quondam*. In *scenae* = ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ, just as *scene* in I. 7 = τῇ σκηνῇ. *Dare de Iesum* seems interpolated. *De* is used in the sense of "by means of," also in V. 1, *de reges*, "by means of the kings."

10. *Verbum hoc*, (*confortare*) *et firma te*. The text here is *verbum hoc*, *et promitte*. Now Moses' address to Joshua cannot begin with *et*. Some verb has fallen out between *hoc* and *et*.

- | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| sen in libro deute | 9 tribus eorum ut de |
| 6 ronomio qui voca | tur illis per testamen |
| vit ad se jesum filium | tum et per jusjuran |
| naue hominem pro | dum quod locutus |
| 7 batum domino ut sit | est in scenae dare |
| successor plebi et | de jesum dicendo ad jesum |
| b scene testimonii | 10 verbum hoc et pro |
| cum omnibus sanctis illius | mitte secus indus |
| 8 ut et inducat plebem | triam tuam omnia |
| in terram datam ex | quae mandata sunt |

Thus there was probably here the oft-repeated phrase addressed to Joshua in Deut. xxxi. 6, 7, 23; Josh. i. 6, 7, 9, 18, חוק ואמץ. Now if we retranslate the present text into Hebrew we shall discover the source of the corruptions and at the same time the original text. The words *verbum hoc et promitte* = הרבר הוה ואמר. Now the missing verb before the ו is clearly חוק, as suggested above; for this could readily fall out after הוה, and אמר is an easy corruption of אמצ as Rosenthal has already seen. Hence the text ran: הרבר הוה חוק ואמץ. This restoration is confirmed by X. 15. See note *in loc.*

Hilgenfeld emended the above words into *verbum hoc ait: promitte*. Volkmar took *ὑπόσχω* = *promitte* to be a corruption of *ὑποσχές* = "undertake."

Omnia quae mandata sunt ut facias. In my translation I have supposed *ut facias* to be wrongly transposed to their present position. The Hebrew

order requires us to place them before *omnia*. But since such faulty transpositions of the Latin text are frequent we cannot argue on this ground against the Hebrew original in favour of an Aramaic. The Aramaic would admit of this order, and Dr. Neubauer assures me the later Hebrew also. But it is possible to regard the text in its present order as derived from the Hebrew. Thus "be strong, and hold fast according to thy might to all that is commanded to be done" would represent חוק ואמץ ככהך בכל הפקודים לעשות. This construction is found in 2 Chron. xxxi. 4, למען יחזקו, בהורת.

Quemadmodum sine quaerellam sis deo. I have here emended *est ideo* into *sis deo*. The *ideo* cannot stand here, as ver. 11 refers to ver. 10. In Luke xxi. 14 of the Vulgate, *praemeditari quemadmodum respondeatis* represents μη προμελετᾶν ἀπολογηθῆναι. The text = להיות חמים לאלהים. Sine has often the

sunt ut facias quemadmodum sine quaerellam sis Deo." 11. Haec dicit Dominus orbis terrarum. 12. Creavit enim orbem terrarum propter plebem suam. 13. Et non coepit eam inceptionem creaturae ab initio orbis terrarum palam facere, ut in ea gentes arguantur et humiliter inter se disputationibus arguant se. 14. Itaque excogitavit et invenit me, qui ab initio orbis terrarum praeparatus sum, ut sim arbiter testamenti illius. 15. Et nunc palam facio tibi quia consummatum est tempus annorum vitae meae et transio in dormitionem patrum meorum et palam omnem plebem. 16. (Tu) autem percipe scribaturam hanc ad recognoscendam tutationem librorum quos tibi tradam: 17. Quos

accusative in the Itala. Schmidt-Merx emend est ideo into est deo.

13. *Non coepit.* The text here, non coepit = οὐκ ἤρξατο = לא הוֹאִיל. But the Greek translator has here followed the inappropriate meaning of לא. He should have rendered οὐκ ἐβούλετο. Hence render "He was not pleased." Merx was the first to discover the real meaning here. He did so through retranslation into Aramaic, לא שרי.

Inceptionem = "design." So also Schmidt-Merx. Hilgenfeld has missed the sense of the passage, as his reproduction of the Greek shows: οὐκ ἤρξατο ταύτην τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τῆς κτίσεως: likewise Rönisch taking non coepit to be a corruption of

inceptit, *Z.f. W.T.* 1874, p. 557: ἀπῆρξατο αὐτὸν ἀπαρχὴν τῆς κτίσεως. Volkmar is wholly at sea.

Ab initio. The MS. inserts et before these words.

Humiliter inter se. Humiliter may be corrupt for humilitate. In my translation I have sought only to give the sense: "to their own" (or "common") "humiliation." Hilgenfeld emends humiliter into similiter.

14. This verse is found in the Greek. See exeg. note, p. 6.

Ab initio orbis terrarum. This phrase has already occurred in I. 13. It recurs twice, I. 17, XII. 4, in the form ab initio creaturae orbis terrarum. Of this verse the Greek (see I. 14, exeg. note) is happily preserved: πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου = לפני מוסרו

- ut facias quemad
modum sine quae
11 rellam est ideo haec
dicit dominus orbis ter
rarum
12 Creavit enim orbem
terrarum propter
13 plebem suam et non
coepit eam inceptio
nem creaturae
111^a et ab initio orbis ter
rarum palam face
re ut in eam gentes
arguantur et humi
liter inter se dispu
tationibus arguant
14 se itaque excogitavit
et invenit me qui ab
initio orbis terra
rum praeeparatus sum
ut sim arbiter testa
15 menti illius et tunc
palam facio tibi quia
consummatum est
tempus annorum
vitae meae et tran
sio in dormitionem
patrum meorum
et palam omnem ple
16 bem autem
percipe scribturam
hanc ad recognos
cendam tutationem
librorum quos tibi
b17 tradam quos ordina
bis et chedriabis et


כְּהוֹדֵךְ הָעוֹלָם אוֹ הָעוֹלָם. It is to be observed that the Vulgate renders Heb. ix. 26; Rev. xiii. 8, ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου by ab origine mundi, similarly as in our text, but elsewhere in the N.T.—Matt. xiii. 35, xxv. 34; Luke xi. 50; Heb. iv. 3; Rev. xvii. 8—by a constitutione mundi. The phrase in I. 17, XII. 4, ab initio creaturae orbis terrarum = ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως τοῦ κόσμου (cf. Mark x. 6, xiii. 19) = בְּרֵאשִׁית בְּרִיאַת הַחֲבֵל. On the other hand, it is quite possible that the latter form of the phrase goes

back to the same Greek as the former, for our Latin translator is far from being consistent or accurate.

15. *Nunc.* MS. tunc.

Palam. Hilgenfeld emends into pellam = ἀπαλλάξω. I follow Rönisch in taking it as a proposition, but the text is doubtful.

16. *Ad recognoscendam tutationem librorum.* The obscurity of this phrase disappears when retranslated into Hebrew, לִשְׂמֹן חָזַק, שְׂמֹן אֶתְחַסְּפִירִים = "mayst know how to preserve."



ordinabis et chedriabis et repones in vasis fictilibus in loco quem fecit ab initio creaturae orbis terrarum, 18. Ut invocetur nomen illius usque in diem paenitentiae in respectu quo respiciet illos Dominus in consummatione exitus dierum.

II. (Et nunc) intrabunt per te in terram, quam decrevit et promisit dare patribus eorum: 2. In qua tu benedices et dabis unicuique, et stabilibis eis sortem in me et constabilibis eis regnum, et magisteria locorum dimittes illis secus quod placebit Domino eorum in iudicio et justitia. 3. (Fiet) autem postquam intrabunt in terram suam anno s(exto), et postea dominabuntur a principibus et tyrannis per annos XVIII, et XVIII annos abrumpent tribus X. 4. Nam descendent tribus

18. *Diem poenitentiae.* Rosenthal supposes an error on the part of the Greek translator, i.e. that he took יום החשובה to mean the day of repentance, whereas it meant "the day of the return," or "of the coming again," and refers to the return of the people to Palestine.

In respectu quo respiciet = ἐν τῇ ἐπισκοπῇ ἣ ἐπισκέψεται—a familiar Hebraism, אשר בפקרה אשר בפקרה בה. Cf. Test. Lev. iii, iv.; Pss. Sol. xi. 2.

In consummatione exitus dierum = ככלות קץ הימים.

II. 1. (*Et nunc*). So Hilgenfeld. Volkmar, ecce nunc.

2. Schmidt-Merx bracket et stabilibis eis as spurious.

In me. Hilgenfeld, in qua.

Rönsch (*Zf. W. T.* 1874, p. 558), in eam where the in eam goes back to in qua, ἐν ᾧ . . . ἐν αὐτῇ.

Magisteria locorum = τοπαρχίας. Probably τοπαρχίας is corrupt for τοπάρχας.

Dimittes. This is corrupt. Schmidt-Merx emend it into dimetieris, but their reference to Pss. Sol. xvii. 30 gives no support to their suggestion. Dimittes may be for demittes = καθήσεις. This may be a corruption of καθσεις or καταστήσεις = "thou wilt appoint." In any case the sense required is clear. The original may have been פקקרים, "thou wilt appoint local magistrates." Cf. Gen. xli. 34.

3. *Fiet.* So Schmidt-Merx; Volkmar, dat; Hilgenfeld, illi.

- reponis in vasis fic
tilibus in loco quem
fecit ab initio crea
turae orbis terra
18 rum ut invocetur
nomen illius usque
in diem paenitentiae
in respectu quo
respicit illos dominus
in consummatio
ne exitus dierum
II. intrabunt
per te in terram
quam decrevit et
promisit dare pa
2 tribus eorum in qua
tu benedicis et da
bis unicuique et sta
bilibus eis sortem
- in me et constabi
libis eis regnum
et magisteria loco
110^a rum dimittes illis
secus quod place
bit domino eorum in ju
dicio et justitia
3 autem postquam
intrabunt in terram
suam annos
et postea dominabi
tur a principibus et
tyrannis per annos
xviii et xviii annos
abrupens tib' x'
4 nam descendent tri
bus duae et transfe
runt scenae testi
monium tunc deus

Anno sexto. From Josh. xiv. 10 and Joseph. *Ant.* v. i. 19, it appears that the Israelites spent five years in the conquest of Canaan. Hence the above emendation. Hilgenfeld, annos (quinque); Merx, annos(eptimo).

Dominabuntur. So Hilgenfeld and Schmidt-Merx. MS. dominabitur.

Abrumpens. So Hilgenfeld, Volkmar, and Fritzsche. *Ab-rumpentes*, Schmidt-Merx; MS. *abrupens*.

Tribus. MS. tib.

4. *Nam.* Nam and enim are frequently used in this version to render δέ.

Descendent. Schmidt-Merx, discedent.

Duodecim. So Schmidt-Merx rightly emend from duae. In 2 Sam. vi. 1, 2, the chosen men of Israel and Judah accompanied David. The corruption arose in the Greek at ιβ' φυλαί by the ι falling out, or else in the Hebrew.

Transferent. MS. transferunt.

duodecim et transferent scenam testimonii. Tunc Deus caelestis faciet aulam scenae suae et turrem sanctuarii sui, et ponentur duae tribus sanctitatis.

5. Nam X tribus stabiliunt sibi secus ordinationes suas regna: 6. Et adferent victimas per annos XX:

7. Et VII circumvallabunt muros, et circumibo

* VIII et (IV) transgredientur testamentum Domini, et jusjurandum polluent quem fecit Dominus cum eis. 8. Et immolabunt natos suos diis alienis, et ponent idola scenae, servientes illis: 9. Et in domo Domini facient sceleste, et sculpent omnem (similitudinem) animalium idola multa.

III. (Et) illis temporibus veniet illis ab

Scenam testimonii. MS. scenae testimonium.

Faciet aulam. So I emend from fecit palam with Hilgenfeld, who compares 2 Chron. xx. 5. The phrase aulam scenae is found in Exod. xxvii. 9. For the various uses of תָּעַר see the new Hebrew Lexicon in loc. Rönsch, figet palum; Schmidt-Merx, fecit palam (zelum); Fritzsche, faciet palum.

Turrem. So I emend from ferrum. In a similar description of the future in Eth. En. lxxxix. 50, 67, 73, the temple is spoken of as a tower. Hilgenfeld, forum, comparing 2 Macc. x. 2; Schmidt-Merx, fervorem. Volkmar gives the whole passage thus: fecit palam (locum) scenae suae et terram sanctuarii sui; Haupt, *Z.f. W.T.* 1867, p. 448, faciet palam (portam) scenae suae et forem sanctuarii sui.

Tribus sanctitatis. Hebraism שְׁבֹטֵי הַקֹּדֶשׁ.

7. Circumibo = I will protect, i.e. אֲסִיבֶנּוּ. Cf. Deut. xxxii. 10; Jer. xxxi. 22.

Et (IV). I have added the (IV).

Transgredientur testamentum Domini et jusjurandum polluent. So I emend the corrupt text: adcedent ad testamentum Domini et finem polluent. First of all, finem = ὄρον, which, as we see from the context, is corrupt for ὄραον. Hence for finem we should read jusjurandum. This combination of testamentum and jusjurandum occurs four other times in this book—I. 9, III. 9, XI. 17, XII. 13, and thus confirms our emendation. The same combination is familiar in the O.T. Cf. Gen. xxvi. 28; Deut. xxix. 12, 14; Ezek. xvi. 59, xvii. 16, 18, 19. In the next place, adcedent testamentum

caelestis fecit pa
lam scenae suae
et ferrum sanctua
rii sui et ponentur
duae tribus sanctita
5 tis nam x' tribus sta
bilient sibi secus
ordinationes suas
66 regna et adferent
victimas per annos
7 xx et vii circumval
labunt muros et
circumibo viiii et

adcedent ad testa
mentum domini et finem
polluent quem fe
8 cit dominus cum eis et im
molabunt natos
suos diis alienis et
ponent idola scenae
servientes illis
9 et in domo domini faci
ent sceleste et s
culpent omnem ani
malium idola multa
III. illis temporibus

and jusjurandum polluent are clearly parallel expressions, and as the latter is obviously right according to the context, the former must be wrong. The corruption therefore lies in adcedent, and is easy to discover. Adcedent = προσβήσονται, corrupt for παραβήσονται. τὴν διαθήκην παραβῆναι is the actual phrase in Ezek. xvi. 59, xvii. 16, 18, 19. Hence for adcedent read transgredientur.

On this passage previous editors are wholly at sea. They all accept adcedent jusjurandum. For et finem, Volkmar reads sed in fine finem; Schmidt-Merx, et (iv) fidem. Hilgenfeld accepts the words as they stand.

8. *Scenae* I take as a dative, "in the Sanctuary." Rönisch (*Z.f.W.T.* 1874, p. 558) ingeniously proposes to read idola obscena, comparing LXX., Jer.

xxxii. (xxxix.) 34, καὶ ἔθηκαν τὰ μιάσματα αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ οὗ ἐπεκλήθη τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἐν ἀκαθαρσίαις αὐτῶν.

9. *Omnem (similitudinem) animalium.* Similitudinem fell out after omnem through homoioteleuton. Hilgenfeld and Volkmar changed omnem into omnium, but the text thus arrived at is intolerable. They failed to recognise that this verse is based on Ezek. viii. 10, "Every form of . . . abominable beasts and all the idols . . . graven upon the wall." Thus omnem similitudinem animalium = כל־חבנית בהמה.

Idola multa, i.e. שקוצים רבים. The word שָׁקַץ is used immediately after בהמה in Ezek. viii. 10, as here. The whole verse = וּבֵית יְהוָה יַעֲשׂוּ תוֹעֵבוֹת וְהָיוּ כָל־חַבְנִית בְּהֵמָה שְׁקֻצִּים רַבִּים.

III. 1. *Veniet . . . equitatu.* MS. venient . . . equitatus.

oriente rex, et teget equitatu terram eorum : 2. Et incendet coloniam eorum igne cum aede sancta Domini, et sancta vasa omnia tollet : 3. Et omnem plebem eiciet, et ducet illos in terram patriae suae, et duas tribus ducet secum. 4. Tunc invocabunt
* duae tribus X tribus, et indignabunt, ut lienā in campis pulveratis, esurientes et sitientes. 5. Et clamabunt : “ Justus et sanctus Dominus, quia enim vos peccastis, et nos pariter abducti sumus vobiscum cum infantibus nostris.” 6. Tunc plorabunt X tribus audientes inproperia verborum tribuum duarum, 7. Et dicent : “ Quid fecimus vobis fratres ? Nonne in omnem domum Istrahel advenit elibsis haec ? ” 8. Et omnes tribus plor-

2. *Coloniam.* MS. colonia.

Sancta vasa omnia. Schmidt-Merx point out that omnia after sancta vasa is not Hebraic but Aramaic order. קרישא סאניא כלחון. This is quite true, but it is impossible, on this ground only, to argue back to an Aramaic original ; for the Greek and Latin translators frequently failed to observe the Hebrew order when it was possible to do so. Thus, though כל in Hebrew always precedes its noun, it is placed after it, as here, in the LXX. in the following passages : Gen. xiv. 11, אחכלידכ שרם—LXX. τῇν Ἰπποκρ πᾶσαν τῇν Σοδόμων. 1. 14, כל-העלם—LXX. οἱ συναβάντες πάντες. Lev. xx. 23, כל אלא—LXX. ταῦτα πάντα. 2 Chron. xxi. 18, אחרי כל-זאת—LXX. μετὰ ταῦτα πάντα. Hence

we can attach but little value to this argument in itself, and when we consider that our Latin Version is but a careless rendering of the original, it ceases to have any weight at all.

3. *Terram patriae suae*=εἰς τῇν γῆν τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ = ארץ סלורחו.

4. *Indignabuntur.* The MS. gives *ducent se*. These words cannot be right. Observe—Tunc invocabunt . . . et ducent se . . . et clamabunt. The ten tribes cannot address the two, then march or be marched about, and then proceed with words of rebuke. Hence, instead of *ducent se*, we expect a verb expressive of anger, and this all the more because of the words immediately subsequent—ut lienā in campis. Now

- venient illis ab ori
 ente rex et teget
 equitatus terram
 2 eorum et incendet
 colonia eorum ig
 ne cum aede sancta
 109^a domini et sancta vasa om
 3 nia tollet et omnem
 plebem eiciet et du
 cet illos in terram
 patriae suae et duas
 tribus ducit secum
 4 Tunc invocabunt
 duae tribus x' tribus
 et ducent se ut liena
 in campis pulverati
 esurientes et siti
 entes cum infantibus
 5 nostris et clamabunt
 justus et sanctus dominus
 quia enim vos peccas
 tis et nos pariter ad
 ducti sumus vobis
 6 cum tunc plora
 bunt 'x' tribus audien
 tes impropéria ver
 borum tribum dua
 7 rum et dicent' quid
 faciemus vobis fra
 tres' nonne in omnem
 8 domum istrahel ad
 venit clibsis haec
 et omnes tribus plora
 bunt clamantes in

ducent se, if retranslated into Greek=*ἀχθήσονται*, and as this word is confounded in MSS. with *ἀχθέσονται*, the latter most probably stood originally in the Greek Version. Hence my correction of ducent se into indignabuntur. Could ducent se be a corruption of succensebunt?

Pulveratis. MS. pulverati. Schmidt-Merx omit.

Sitientes. Here the MS. adds cum infantibus nostris. This phrase I have, with Schmidt-Merx, transposed after vobiscum in ver. 4. If retained here, nostris must be changed into suis; for

the children of the two tribes cannot be called children of Moses and Joshua.

5. *Abducti.* So Fritzsche; Schmidt-Merx, deducti. MS. adducti.

Cum infantibus nostris. See note on ver. 4.

6. *Inpropéria verborum* = הַיִּכְבוֹת.

7. *Fecimus.* So I emend with Hilgenfeld from faciemus.

Clibsis, i.e. θλίψις. There are several other Greek words—acrobystia (VIII. 3), cathedra (XII. 2), eremus (III. 11), chedriabis (I. 17), allofyli (IV. 3).

abunt clamantes in caelum et dicentes : 9. "Deus Abraham et Deus Isaac et Deus Iacob, reminiscere testamentum tuum quod factasti cum eis, et iusjurandum quod iurasti eis per Te, ne unquam deficiat semen eorum a terra quam dedisti illis." 10. Tunc reminiscuntur me, die illo dicentes tribus ad tribum et homo de proximo suo : 11. "Nonne hoc est quod testabatur nobis tum Moyses in profetiis, qui multa passus est in Aegypto et in mari rubro et in heremo annis XL : 12. Et testans invocabat nobis testes caelum et terram, ne praeteriremus mandata Illius, in quibus arbiter fuit nobis : 13. Ecce ea advenerunt nobis de isto secus verba ipsius et secus adfirmationem ipsius, quomodo testatus est nobis temporibus illis, ecce ea convenerunt usque nos duci captivos in

9. *Reminiscere* = ἀναμνησκού.

10. *Homo de proximo suo* = ἄνθρωπος ἐπὶ τῷ πλησίον αὐτοῦ = אִישׁ לְרֵעֵהוּ.

11. *Tum*. So Schmidt-Merx. MS. cum.

Moses. This name is written thus in XI. 1, and the interpolated passage I. 5. In I. 4 Mosyses. Elsewhere, in XI. 2, 4, 14, 17, 19, XII. 1, 2, it is written as if from a Nom. Monses. For a similar insertion of n, cf. Bobbio MS., *q*. Mt. vi. 19, thensaurus, etc. Moyses is the Coptic form of this name. The Hebrew form Moses = מֹשֶׁה = משה, which Schmidt-Merx give in I. 1, is not found in this MS.

Testabatur. This word means here "he declared." It represents

διεβεβαιούτο, and this in turn, הִוִּיר or הִוִּר. The same diction lies behind adfirmationem ipsius quomodo testatus est (III. 13) = διαβεβαίωσιν καθὼς διεβεβαιούτο. It is due to the carelessness of the Latin translator that he used testor as a rendering of two distinct Greek verbs.

Profetiis. MS. profetis.

12. *Et testans invocabat nobis testes caelum et terram*. For et testans the MS. reads, testatus et, but wrongly; for clearly testans invocabat . . . testes = διαμαρτυρούμενος διεμαρτύρετο = והעד העיר, and the whole phrase = והעד העיר בנו את-השמים ואת-הארץ. This statement is found, letter for letter, in the Apocalypse of Baruch lxxxiv. 2, "Moses

- caelum et dicentes
 9 deus abraham· et deus isa
 ac· et deus jacob remi
 niscere testamen
 tum tuum quod fac
 tasti cum eis et jus
 jurandum quod ju
 rasti eis per te ne um
 quam deficiat semen
 eorum a terra quam
 dedisti illis
 10 Tunc reminiscetur
 me die illo dicentes
 tribus ad tribum· et
 homo de proximo
 11 suo nonne hoc est
- quod testabatur no
 bis cum moyses in
 profetis qui multa
 85^a passus est in aegypto
 et in mari rubro· et
 in heremo annis ·xl·
 12 testatus et invoca
 bat nobis testes cae
 lum et terram ne prae
 teriremus manda
 ta illius in quibus arbi
 13 ter fuit nobis quae
 advenerunt nobis
 de isto secus verba
 ipsius· et secus adfir
 mationem ipsius

assuredly called heaven and earth to witness against you." Cf. Deut. iv. 26, xxx. 19, etc.

Ne praeteriremus mandata Illius. These words, also in a slightly different form, follow immediately on those just quoted from Apoc. Bar. lxxxiv. 2, *i.e.* "if ye transgress the law."

13. *Ecce ea advenerunt nobis.* So I have emended from quae advenerunt nobis. That this is right is clear from the exactly parallel passage in Apoc. Bar. lxxxiv. 5, "And now Moses used to tell you before they befell you, and lo! they have befallen you." Schmidt-Merx,

followed by Hilgenfeld, emend quae into vae; Volkmar resolves it into et ea.

De isto. This is taken to = ἐξ ἐκείνου (χρόνου). A comparison of the parallel passage in Apoc. Bar. lxxxiv. 4, "And after his (*i.e.* Moses') death ye cast them away from you (see also XIX. 3), on this account they came upon you," appears to show that de isto = אחרי = "after him," *i.e.* "after his death." Cf. Job xxi. 21.

Ecce ea. So I have emended et quae. See above.

In partem orientis = εἰς μέρος τῆς ἀνατολῆς = אל-קצה ארץ קדם Cf. Exod. xvi. 35.

partem orientis?" 14. Qui et servient circa annos LXXVII.

IV. Tunc intrabit unus qui supra eos est, et expandet manus et ponet genua sua, et orabit pro eis dicens: 2. "Domine omnis, rex in alta sede, qui dominaris saeculo, qui voluisti plebem hanc esse tibi plebem hanc exceptam, tunc voluisti invocari eorum deus secus testamentum, quod fecisti cum patribus eorum. 3. Et ierunt captivi in terram alienam cum uxoribus et natis suis et circa ostium
* allofylorum et ubi est vanitas magna. 4. Respice et miserere eorum, Domine caelestis." 5. Tunc reminiscetur Deus eorum propter testamentum quod fecit cum patribus illorum, et palam faciet misericordiam suam et temporibus illis: 6. Et mittet in animam regis ut misereatur eorum, et dimittet illos

14. Merx reproduces this verse in Aramaic: אנון רי יעברין יהי עו' שנין, and thinks that there is a play on the words "עו" (= 77) also = עבירה (= idolatry), as this latter phrase was often simply denoted by the initial letters. Thus, "they shall also practise idolatry through the years." If this play was intended by the author, it proves nothing for an Aramaic original against a Hebrew, as עברה ורה is good Hebrew also.

IV. 1. For *intrabit, expandet, ponet*, MS. reads *intravit, expandit, ponit*.

2. *Domine omnis* = κύριε τοῦ παντός = Heb. ארון כל; Aram. כורא כל.

Plebem hanc exceptam. Hanc here represents the Greek article: τὸν λαὸν τὸν ἐκλεκτόν = העם הבחיר. Cf. Isa. xliii. 20. *Exceptam* is here an unhappy rendering. We should have *electam*.

3. *Vanitas.* The MS. reads *majestas*. This is corrupt. Hilgenfeld and Merx emend it into *maestitia*; Fritzsche into *moestia*. Volkmar supports the text, but without success. The corruption is not native to the Latin. *Majestas* = μεγαλειότης, corrupt for ματαιότης, "vanity," i.e. "idolatry." Nothing impressed the Jews so much in their captivity among the Gentiles as the idolatry of the latter.

- quomodo testatus
est nobis tempori
bus illis et quae conve
nerunt usque nos
duci captivos in par
14 tem orientis qui
et servient circa
annos 'lxxvii'
- IV. Tunc intravit unus
qui supra eos est
et expandit manus
et ponit genua sua
b et oravit pro eis di
2 cens Domine omnis
rex in alta sede qui
dominaris saeculo
qui voluisti plebem
hanc esse tibi plebem
hanc exceptam tunc
voluisti invocari
eorum deus secus tes
tamentum quod fe
cisti cum patribus
3 eorum et ierunt
captivi in terram
alienam cum uxori
bus et natis suis et
circa ostium allofi
lorum et ubi est
majestas magna
4 respice et misere
re eorum domine cae
5 lestis Tunc remi
niscitur deus eorum
propter testamen
tum quod fecit cum
86a patribus illorum et
palam faciet mise
ricordiam suam et
6 temporibus illis et
mittit in animam re
gis ut misereator
eorum et dimittit
illos in terram eorum

For this use of *παράκλησις* for an idol, cf. Ps. xxxi. 6, etc: *τὰ παράκλησις* is frequent in this sense. Cf. 2 Kings xvii. 15; Jer. ii. 5, x. 3. *יִזְכֵּר* is the Hebrew.

5. *Reminiscetur*. MS. *reminiscitur*.

Suam et. Hilgenfeld and Schmidt-Merx delete *et*.

6. *Miseratur*. MS. *misereator*. *Dimittet*. MS. *dimittit*.

Terram eorum et regionem. Semitic syntax requires an *eorum* after the *regionem*. But the Greek and Latin translators of Hebrew omitted the suffix in their rendering. Cf. LXX. 1 Chron. xxviii. 11;

in terram eorum et regionem. 7. Tunc ascendent aliquae partes tribuum et venient in locum constitutum suum et circumvallabunt locum renovantes.

8. Duae autem tribus permanebunt in praeposita fide sua, tristes et gementes, quia non poterint referre immolationes Domino patrum suorum. 9.

* Et X tribus crescent et multiplicantur apud nationes in tempore captivitatis suae.

V. Et cum adpropinquabunt tempora arguendi, et vindicta surget de reges participes scelerum et punientes eos, 2. Et ipsi dividuntur ad veritatem.

Vulg. Gen. xli. 8; Exod. xii. 9, xl. 18; Neh. iii. 3, 6, 13, 14, 15.

8. *Sua*. Volkmar and Schmidt-Merx emend into sed.

Poterint. Schmidt-Merx emend into poterunt.

9. *Multiplicantur apud nationes in tempore captivitatis suae*. So I have emended the very corrupt text devenient apud natos in tempore tribum. Hilgenfeld accepts the text, but changes tribum into tribulationis, and takes these words as prophecy of the return of the tribes to their descendants in Jerusalem. But this is absolutely impossible. Not to speak of the incredible change of tribulationis into tribum, there are other insuperable difficulties. If apud natos could stand here at all, we should require suos to be added. And finally, devenient could not be used of *going up* to Jerusalem. The great "Songs of the Ascents" would, in that case, be called "Songs of the Descents."

The right word in such a case would be ascendent (see ver. 7). Volkmar emends: devenient apud natos in tempore tribum. But there is no meaning in the expression in tempore tribum. Further, it is an unparalleled phrase. Schmidt-Merx emend: devertent apud nationes in tempore turbarum. But the sense is poor, "they will stay amongst the Gentiles in the time of troubles," and Fritzsche and Rosenthal rightly reject it.

Rosenthal emends: devenient apud natos in tempore iudiciorum. In the criticism of Hilgenfeld's emendation we have already shown devenient apud natos in the sense of a return to Palestine to be impossible. Some interest, however, attaches to his restoration in tempore iudiciorum. In tempore tribuum is, he shows = בעת השבטים, where השבטים is corrupt for השפטים. The time of the judgments is that of the final judgment of God.

7 et regionem tunc
 ascendent aliquae
 partes tribuum et
 venient in locum
 constitutum suum
 et circumvallabunt
 locum renovantes
 8 duae autem tribus
 permanebunt in
 praeposita fide sua
 tristes et gemen
 tes quia non pote
 rint referre im

molationes domino
 patrum suorum
 9 et 'x' tribus cres
 cent et devenient
 apud natos in tem
 V. pore tribum et
 cum adpropriabunt
 tempora arguendi
 et vindicta surgit
 de reges participes
 scelerum et puni
 2 entes eos et ipsi
 dividuntur ad ve

We have now discussed all previous emendations of this text, and been obliged to reject them. My own restoration is as follows. First of all, I accept the emendation apud natos into apud nationes. Next, we see that something is wrong with devenient. It is coupled with crescent, and not improbably has a kindred meaning. Now devenient = κατελεύσονται = ירבו, which is clearly a corruption of ירבו = multiplicantur. Thus the text runs, crescent et multiplicantur apud nationes. We have now to deal with in tempore tribum. This tribum is a frequent fifth-century equivalent of tribuum. The phrase, then, in tempore tribuum = בעת שבטים. Here בעת שבטים is corrupt for בעת שבטים = in tempore captivitatis suae. Thus our emended text

= crescent et multiplicantur apud nationes in tempore captivitatis suae. Now this agrees exactly with the statement of Joseph. *Ant.* xi. 5. 2, Αἱ δὲ δέκα φυλαὶ πέραν εἰσὶν Εὐφράτου ἕως δεῦρο, μυριάδες ἄπειροι, καὶ ἀριθμῶ γνωσθῆναι μὴ δυνάμεναι, and with the view expressed in 4 Ezra xiii. 36-48; Philo, *Leg. ad Caium*, 31 (ii. 578, Mangey), ἐφόβουν δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ αἱ πέραν Εὐφράτου δυνάμεις· ἦδει γὰρ Βαβυλῶνα καὶ πολλὰς ἄλλας τῶν σατραπειῶν ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων κατεχομένας.

V. 1. *Surget.* MS. surgit. *De reges* = διὰ τῶν βασιλέων. De here = per, as in I. 9, de Iesum. So Rönsch and Hilgenfeld. Schmidt-Merx, not observing the above sense of de, propose to emend de reges participes into ad participes regis, and punientes into punientis.

2. *Dividentur ad veritatem* =

3. Propter quod factum fuit: "Devitabunt justitiam et accedent ad iniquitatem, et contaminabunt iniquationibus domum servitutis suae," et quia "fornicabunt post deos alienos." 4. Non enim sequentur veritatem Dei, sed quidam altarium inquinabunt de ipsis muneribus quae imponent Domino, qui non sunt sacerdotes, sed servi de servis nati. 5. Qui enim magistri sunt [doctores eorum]

διαμερισθήσονται πρὸς τὴν ἀληθείαν = יִחְלְקוּ בִּאֱמֶת. In 1 Kings xvi. 21, חֶלֶק is used in the Niphal of the division of the people into two factions as here. In the Talmud it is frequently used in reference to difference of opinion. Cf. Chag. xvi. b, נִחְלְקוּ בֵּה נִרְוִי, הָרַר = "the greatest Rabbis were divided on this point," quoted in Levy's *Lex.* ii. 65.

Propter quod = διότι.

Factum. Volkmar emends into dictum, and Schmidt-Merx into fatum.

3. *Iniquationibus*. So Volkmar and Hilgenfeld, from iniquationibus. Schmidt-Merx (and later Hilgenfeld also), in nationibus.

4. *De ipsis muneribus*. I have here followed Rönsch, in supplying the lacuna of six letters with ipsis. Hilgenfeld gives iis; Volkmar, omnibus; Schmidt-Merx, donis et.

5. *Qui enim magistri sunt* [doctores eorum]. If we study this clause in connexion with the rest of this verse and that which follows, it will become obvious that there is some corruption here. For whereas magistri doctores eorum are

naturally to be regarded as forming the class of teachers, their functions in the text are of quite a different nature. They are judges, and their justice is venal. Now if we retranslate into Greek and thence into Hebrew we shall be put in the way of discovering not merely the original text, but also a most interesting case in which what was at first an incorrect Hebrew marginal gloss was later incorporated in the text. To proceed: qui enim magistri sunt doctores eorum = (with Hilgenfeld) οἱ δὲ διδάσκαλοι ὄντες, οἱ καθηγῶνται αὐτῶν = מורייהם מוריהם (cf. John i. 39). Now, first of all, we know that מורייהם, which can mean either "the Rabbis" or "the many," cannot have the former meaning in this context, as we have seen above; and in the next, we see that the latter meaning, "the many," harmonises perfectly with the rest of the context. For whereas in ver. 4b it is said that *some* who are not true priests will defile the altar of God, it is here said that *many* will administer justice corruptly, the

- 3 ritatem propter
quod factum fuit
devitabunt justi
tiam et accedent
ad iniquitatem et
contaminabunt in
generationibus domum
servitutis suae
et quia fornicabunt
post deos alienos
4 non enim sequen
tur veritatem dei

- sed quidam altarium
inquinabunt de
78a muneribus quae
inponent domino qui
non sunt sacerdo
tes sed servi de ser
5 vis nati qui enim ma
gistri sunt docto
res eorum illis tem
poribus erunt miran
tes personas cupi
ditatum et accep

"some" and the "many" be-
longing alike to the Sadducean
party, to the Sanhedrin, the
chief council of the nation.
The Sanhedrin possessed civil
and criminal jurisdiction (Schü-
rer, div. ii. vol. i. 187), and was
at this period a body representa-
tive of the nobility, and not an
association of learned men (*op.*
cit. p. 174), as the Rabbins and
the glosser on our text conceived
it later. Having now deter-
mined the meaning of הרבים to
be not "the Rabbis," but "the
many," or "many," we now see
that מריהם (*i.e.* doctores eorum)
must originally have been a
Hebrew gloss inserted in the
margin to explain הרבים. That
the glosser misapprehended the
sense of the word is now obvious.
Hence we should translate, "and
many in those times will respect
the persons of the rich," etc.

Locupletum. The MS. gives
cupiditatum. I have adopted

Fritzsche's suggestion of locuple-
tum, though he edits nobilitatum
in his own text. Schmidt-Merx
propose (cupidi) cupiditatum.

Accipientes munera = δωρο-
ληπτοῦντες or δωρολήπταις. So
I emend' acceptiones munerum.
The corruption may have arisen
in the Greek by δωρολήπταις be-
coming δωροληψίας.

Pervertent. So Wieseler
emends from pervendent. The
three chief statements in this
verse, that men will be mirantes
personas, and acceptores mun-
erum, and pervertent justitias
are drawn from Deut. xvi. 19.
Pervertent justitias is based on
לא תהא משפט, "thou shalt not
wrest judgment." Erunt miran-
tes . . . justitias = יהיו מכירים
פני העשירים ולוקחים שחר והמו משפט.

Accipiendo poenas = accipien-
tes poenas. This use of the
ablative of the gerund for the
present participle is character-
istic of this Latin version. Cf. XI.

illis temporibus, erunt mirantes personas locupletum et accipientes munera, et pervertent justitias [accipiendo poenas]. 6. Et ideo implebitur colonia et fines habitationis eorum sceleribus et iniquitatibus.

* A Domino deficient, erunt impii iudices, et erunt in argento judicare quomodo quisque volet.

VI. Tunc exurgent illis reges imperantes, et in sacerdotes summi Dei vocabuntur: facient facientes impietatem ab sancto sanctitatis. 2. Et succedet illis rex petulans, qui non erit de genere sacerdotum, homo temerarius et improbus, et judicabit

17. This usage is frequently found in the oldest biblical translations. See Rönisch, *Z.f. W.T.* 1868, pp. 96, 97. As these words are simply a repetition of the phrase accipientes munera, I have bracketed them as a dittography. The only other alternative is to regard accipientes munera as representing *δωροληπτοῦντες* = *בזעם בזעם* = greedy after gain (Prov. xv. 27). There will then be no tautology in the verse: "They will respect the persons of the rich and be greedy of gain, and will wrest judgment on receiving presents." This form of the text would imply a knowledge of 1 Sam. viii. 3.

6. We have here a remarkable dittography, in which six lines of the MS. are repeated twice with some slight variations. The second is slightly more correct. The scribe no doubt intended to delete the former, but forgot. I here append the repeated portions side by side.

finis habita tiones eorum sce leribus et ini quita tibus a deo ut qui fa cit erunt impii ju dices erunt in eam post	finis habita tionis sceler ibus et iniquitat ibus a domino qui faciunt erunt impii judices inerunt in campo
---	---

If we compare the concluding words of each column, it is clear that erunt in eam post in the first is corrupt for erunt in campo et. I have given above the text presupposed by the twofold text.

A Domino deficient. So I emend from the corrupt twofold text a deo ut qui facit and a dño qui faciunt. Hilgenfeld reads: adeo jus qui faciunt. Volkmar and Schmidt-Merx connect a domino and a deo respectively with what precedes, and proceed: Volkmar, (quae) qui faciunt

tiones munerum
et pervendent
justitias accipien
6 do poenas et ideo
implebitur colo
nia et finis habita
tiones eorum sce
leribus et iniquita
tibus a deo ut qui fa
cit erunt impii ju
dices erunt in eam
post fines habita
tionis sceleribus

erunt impii judices; Schmidt-Merx, ut qui factarunt impie, judices erunt in ea inpost (=in posterum), etc.

Erunt in argento judicare. So I emend erunt in campo judicare. In campo = *ἐν ἀργῶ*, corrupt for *ἐν ἀργύρῳ* = בכסף. Erunt judicare is either corrupt for erunt judicantes or else it is to be referred back to the Hebrew. יהיו לשפוט = "they will be intent or ready to judge." For this construction cf. 2 Chron. xxvi. 5. Hilgenfeld takes in campo = *ἐν πεδίῳ*, corrupt for *ἐμπροσθεν*, but the resulting sense is bad.

VI. 1. In summos sacerdotes Dei vocabuntur. This emended text (see below) = *ἐς ἀρχιερεῖς τοῦ θεοῦ κληθήσονται* = וְקראוּ עַל הַכֹּהֲנִים הַגְּדֹלִים לְאֱלֹהִים. With this construction cf. LXX., 1 Chron. xxiii. 14, *ἐκλήθησαν ἐς φυλὴν τοῦ Λευί* = Massoretic, וְקראוּ עַל

et iniquitatibus

b a domino qui faciunt
erunt impii judices
inerunt in campo
judicare quomodo

VI. quisquae volet tunc
exurgent illis re
ges imperantes et
in sacerdotes sum
mi dei vocabuntur
facient facientes
impietatem ab sancto

2 sanctitatis et succedit illis

הָלִי שָׁנָה = "were numbered among the tribe of Levi." But the Niphal קרא has here a middle sense, as in Isa. xlviii. 2: "they will number themselves among the priests," i.e. "will call themselves priests." Thus the non-Greek expression *ἐς ἱερεῖς κληθήναι* is to be explained from a Hebrew background. Instead of summos sacerdotes in the clause in summos sacerdotes Dei vocabuntur, the text reads sacerdotes summi. For the grounds for this emendation see exegetical note, pp. 20, 21. Fritzsche unjustifiably changes in into qui.

Facient facientes: the well-known Hebraism = עָשׂוּ יַעֲשׂוּ; yet Schmidt-Merx emend it into in faciem facientes! Volkmar and Hilgenfeld omit facient, while Fritzsche omits facientes!

2. *Succedet.* MS. succedit.

illis quomodo digni erunt: 3. Qui elidet principales eorum gladio, et locis ignotis stinguet corpora illorum, ut nemo sciat ubi sint [corpora illorum]: 4. Occidet majores natu et juvenes, et non parcet. 5. Tunc timor erit illius acerbus [in eis] in terram eorum: 6. Et faciet in eis judicia, quomodo fecerunt in illis Aegyptii, per XXX et IIII annos, et punibit eos. 7. Et (p)roducet natos (qui su)ccedentes sibi breviora tempora dominarent. 8. In partes eorum cohortes venient et occidentis rex potens, qui expugnabit eos: 9. Et ducet captivos et partem aedis ipsorum igni incendet, (et) aliquos crucifiget circa coloniam eorum.

VII. Ex quo facto finientur tempora, momento (fini)etur cursus a(lter) horae IIII venient. 2. Co-

Judicabit illis. Is this to be explained by הוֹן בָּהֶם (cf. Ps. cx. 6), or should we correct illis into illos?

3. *Elidet.* MS. elidit.

Stinguet. So Rönsch, from MS. singuli et. Hilgenfeld, sepeliet; Schmidt-Merx, jugulabit. Stinguet = extinguet. [Corpora illorum] I have, with Schmidt-Merx, bracketed as an intrusion.

4. *Occidet.* MS. occidit. Hilgenfeld and Volkmar omit the et before non: "and he will not spare the young."

5. *Acerbus.* MS. acervus. With Schmidt-Merx I bracket in eis.

6. *Punibit.* Hilgenfeld and Volkmar, from puniunt.

7. *(P)roducet natos (qui su)cce-*

dent sibi breviora tempora dominarent. So Hilgenfeld and Fritzsche, emending donarent of MS. into dominant. Volkmar, (p)roducet natos, (q) d)ecedentes sibi duriora tempora donarent; Schmidt-Merx, (p)roducet natos succedentes sibi et punientes eos breviora tempora donec repente.

8. *Partes.* MS. pares. *Cohortes.* So Volkmar, from MS. mortes. Gutschmidt, hostes; Rönsch, martiales.

Occidentis. MS. occidentes.

Qui. So Schmidt-Merx, from quia.

9. *Ducet.* MS. ducent. *Incendet.* MS. incendit. *Et* I have added with Schmidt-Merx.

Crucifiget. MS. crucifigit.

rex petulans qui
 non erit de genere
 sacerdotum homo
 temerarius et im
 probus et iudicabit
 illis quomodo dig
 3 ni erunt qui elidit
 principales eorum
 gladio et locis igno
 tis singuli et corpo
 ra illorum ut ne
 mo sciat ubi sint
 77^a corpora illorum
 4 occidit maiores
 natu et juvenes
 5 et non parcat tunc
 timor erit illius a
 cervus in eis in ter
 6 ram eorum et faci
 et in eis iudicia quo
 modo fecerunt in

illis aegypti per 'xxx
 et 'iiii' annos et pu
 7 niunt eos 'et . . . rodu
 cit natos . . . eceden
 tes sibi breviora tem
 8 pora donarent in
 pares eorum mor
 tis venient et occi
 dentes rex potens
 quia expugnabit eos
 9 et ducent captivos
 et partem aedis ipso
 rum igni incendit
 aliquos crucifigit
 circa coloniam eorum
 b VII. ex quo facto finien
 tur tempora nomen
 to etur cursus
 a horae 'iiii' ve
 2 niant coguntur secun
 ae pos

VII. 1. *Facto*. Schmidt-Merx omit.

(*Fini*)*etur*. So Hilgenfeld, Volkmar, Wieseler. Schmidt-Merx and Colani read (sequ)*etur*.

A(lter). So Schmidt-Merx, Colani. Volkmar, quando: Hilgenfeld, a(evi).

Venient. So Hilgenfeld, Volkmar, Schmidt-Merx, from MS. *veniant*.

2. Though it is quite impossible to restore this verse, many scholars have made the attempt. We cannot discover the actual words of the writer: even if we knew them, their interpretation would be difficult, as they are enigmatical or symbolical. Yet certain scholars presume they know the hidden meaning of the writer, and re-

gentur secun 3. Et regnabunt de
his homines pestilentiosi et impii, dicentes se esse
justos. 4. Et hi concealabunt iram animorum suorum,
qui erunt homines dolosi, sibi placentes, ficti in
omnibus suis et omni hora diei amantes convivia,
devoratores, gulae. 5. 6. (Paupe)rum
bonorum comestores, dicentes se haec facere propter
misericordiam suam 7. sed ut exterminarent eos,
quaeru(losi), fallaces, celantes se ne possent cog-
noscī, impii, in scelere pleni et iniquitate ab (sole)

store the text accordingly. With such a defective text to start from, they can easily read their own ideas into it, and they so manage their restorations as to make the text attest the period they have settled beforehand. Hilgenfeld restores as follows: Ex quo facto finientur tempora. momento (fini)etur cursus a(evi). horae IIII venient. Coguntur secus (septim)as .VII. pos(tumas) initiis tribus ad exitus. VIIII propter initium, tres septimae secunda, tria in tertia, duae quartae. Volkmar, Ex quo facto finientur tempora. momento (fini)etur cursus, q(ando) horae .IIII. veniant. Coguntur secun(da, medi)a, e(t sic) pos(tuma in) initiis tribus ad exitus. VIII propter initium. tres (ēws) septimae. Secunda tria. in tertia duae (p)eractae. Schmidt-Merx, Ex quo finientur tempora momento . (sequ)etur cursus alter; horae .IIII. venient. Coguntur secun(do septiman)ae VIIII, pos(tumae ab) initiis tribulationis ad exitus. VIIII propter (fort. tempora) initium,

tres septim(an)ae secunda, tria tertia, duae eractae. Colani, Ex quo facto finientur tempora momento . (sequ)etur cursus a(Iter). horae IIII venient. coguntur secu(li tempor)a e(jus) pos(trema) ab initiis tribulationis ad exitus VIIII. propter initium tres septimae. secunda tria. in tertia duae (p)eractae. Wieseler, Horae IIII venient: coguntur secul(i septim)ae (dirae?) pos(tumae in) initiis tribus ad exitus VIIII; propter initium tres septimae, secunda tria(s), in tertia duae h(o)ra(e p)eractae.

3. *Regnabunt.* Hilgenfeld and Schmidt-Merx, from MS. regnarunt. Is et regnarunt a Hebraism? i.e. יִשְׁלֹו.

Dicentes. Hilgenfeld, from MS. docentes.

4. *Concealabunt.* The MS. reads suscitabunt. But the following word dolosi and ficti seem to show that not the rousing of their anger, but its suppression or concealment, is the thought here required.

. . . . initiis tribus ad
 exitus viiii propter
 initium tres sep
 timae secunda tria
 in tertia duae h . . ra..
 3 tae et regnarunt
 de his homines pes
 tilentiosi et impii
 docentes se esse
 4 justos et hi susci
 tabunt iram animo
 rum suorum qui
 erunt homines do
 losi sibi placentes
 ficti in omnibus suis
 et omni hora diei
 amantes convivia
 devoratores gulae

68 a s . . . n . . . ca
 nus diis
 omnis

 u o
 rae elen
 6 tes rum bo
 norum comesto
 res dicentes se haec
 facere propter mi
 sericordiam qu . . .
 7 se et extermina
 tores quaeru . . .
 fallaces celantes se
 ne possent cognos
 ci impii in scelere
 pleni et iniquitate
 ab oriente usque ad

Sibi placentes. This does not appear to give the right sense, coming as it does between dolosi and ficti. The corruption may be traceable to the Hebrew. Sibi placentes = *ἐαυτοῖς ἀρέσκοντες* = *מבקשי הנאה עצמם*. Here *עצמם* may be corrupt for *עצמים*, i.e. "the mighty." Hence we should render "pleasers of the mighty."

5. This verse, consisting of seven lines, is undecipherable.

6. (*Paupere*)rum. So Volkmar.

Suam. MS. qu . . . Volk-

mar, emends into eorum; Hilgenfeld, quare.

7. *Sed ut.* MS. se et. Volkmar, si et; Hilgenfeld, sicut; Fritzsche, sed et.

Quaeru(losi). MS. quaeru . . . Hilgenfeld, quaeru(nt); Volkmar, quaeru(nt qui); Fritzsche, queru(li et).

Ab oriente usque ad occidentem. Cf. XI. 8. Observe that this = *ἀφ' ἡλίου ανατέλλοντος μέχρι δύο- μένου*. Thus it can equally well mean "from east to west" or "from sunrise to sunset."

orientē usque ad occidentem, 8. Dicentes: "Habebimus discubitiones et luxuriam, edentes et bibentes, et potabimus nos, tanquam principes erimus." 9. Et manus eorum et mentes immunda tractantes, et os eorum loquetur ingentia, et superdicent: 10. "Noli (tu me) tangere, ne inquines me loco in quo (ego) s(to)

VIII. Et (al)te(ra) veniet in eos ultio et ira, quae talis non fuit in illis a saeculo usque ad illud tempus, in quo suscitabit illis regem regum terrae et potentatem a potentia magna, qui confitentes circumcisionem in cruce suspendet, 2. Nam celantes torquebit et tradidit duci vinctos in

8. *Et potabimus.* So Hilgenfeld, from et putavimus. Volkmar, si mutavimus; Rönsch, perpotabimus. If with Fritzsche we emend putavimus into putabimus, we should expunge erimus and render "we shall esteem ourselves as princes."

9. *Mentes.* Hilgenfeld emends into dentes. The sentence—et manus eorum et mentes immunda tractantes et os eorum loquetur ingentia is thoroughly Hebraistic, beginning with a circumstantial clause. Cf. 1 Sam. ix. 11. (See Driver, pp. 238, 239.) וידיהם ולבבם ננעים במסאות פיהם ידבר נרלות.

10. *Noli (tu me) tangere.* So Volkmar.

VIII. 1. *Et (al)te(ra) veniet.* So Schmidt-Merx restore. Cf. IX. 2. Hilgenfeld and Volkmar; et cito adveniet; Fritzsche, ec(ce) ta(nta) veniet.

Quae talis non fuit in illis a saeculo usque ad illud tempus = οἷα οὐκ ἐγένετο ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἕως ἐκείνου τοῦ καιροῦ. This clause is based on Dan. xii. 1. Cf. Jer. xxx. 7. It will be observed that a saeculo usque ad illud tempus does not agree with the LXX. ἀφ' οὗ ἐγενήθησαν ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης, nor with Theodotion, ἀφ' ἧς γεγέννηται ἔθνος ἐν τῇ γῇ ἕως τοῦ καιροῦ ἐκείνου. It is nearer to the Syriac, which = a diebus saeculorum, which is defective here. Instead of the Massoretic כהיות גוי עד העת ההיא, our text and the Syriac imply מיסות עד עד העת ההיא. Now it is remarkable that, in Mt. xxiv. 21, where this verse from Daniel recurs, we have practically the same text as that presupposed by the Syriac of Daniel and by our text. Mt. xxiv. 21 runs, θλίψις μεγάλη, οἷα

8 occidentem dicen
tes habebimus dis
cubitiones et luxu
riam edentes et
bibentes
Et putavimus nos
b tanquam principes
9 erimus et manus
eorum et mentes
inmunda tractantes
et os eorum loque
tur ingentia et su
10 per dicent *noli*
tange ne inquines
me loco in quo . . . s . . .
. . . is d
su *us*

in
re *ravi*

VIII. in plebem quae s . . a.
illis et . . ta . . ve
niet in eos ultio et
ira quae talis non
fuit in illis a saeculo
usque ad illum tem
pus in quo suscita
vit illis regem regum
terrae et potesta
tem a potentia mag
na qui confitentes

67a circumcisionem
in cruce suspendit
2 Nam necantes tor
quebit et tradidit

οὐ γέγονεν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κόσμου ἕως
τοῦ νῦν. Here ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κόσμου
is probably a free rendering of
מִסִּדְּמָה עַד. In Isa. xliii. 12, ἀπ'
ἀρχῆς is the LXX. rendering of
מִיּוֹם. αἰῶνος would have been a
better rendering of the Semitic
original of Mt. than κόσμον.
Thus there seems some connec
tion between our text and Mt.
xxiv. 21. On the other hand,
we have in Rev. xvi. 18 an in
dependent rendering of the
Hebrew of Dan. xii. 1. For
similar phraseology, cf. Jer.
xxx. 7; Dan. ix. 12; 1 Macc.
ix. 27.

Potestatem. So Rönisch, from
potestatem. Yet potestatem
may = τὸν ἐξουσιάζοντα = ἐνέση.
Potestatem a potentia magna
may = τὸν ἐξουσιάζοντα ἐξουσία
μεγάλῃ.

Suspendet. MS. suspendit.
Illud. MS. illum. *Suscitabit.*
MS. suscitavit.

2. *Celantes.* So I emend
necantes of MS. Hilgenfeld,
negantes; Schmidt-Merx, non
negantes. Those who conceal
their circumcision are set over
against those who openly confess
it. Or should we read (circum)-
secantes, or possibly secantes

custodiam. 3. Et uxores eorum deis donabuntur (in) gentibus, et filii eorum pueri secabuntur a medicis inducere acrobistiam illis. 4. Nam illi in eis punientur in tormentis et igne et ferro, et cogentur palam baiulare idola eorum inquinata, quomodo sunt pariter continentibus ea. 5. Et a torquentibus illos pariter cogentur intrare in abditum locum eorum, et cogentur stimulis blasphemare verbum contumeliose, novissime post haec leges et quod haberent supra altarium suum.

IX. Tunc illo die erit homo de tribu Levi, cujus nomen erit Taxo, qui habens VII filios dicet ad eos rogans: 2. "Videte, filii, ecce ultio facta est in plebe altera crudelis immunda et traductio sine misericordia et eminens principatum. 3. Quae enim gens, aut quae regio, aut quis populus impiorum in Dominum, qui multa scelestia fecerunt, tanta

only, = "those who circumcise." Cf. 1 Macc. i. 61, where it is recorded that those who did this operation were put to death.

Et tradidit. If the text is correct, we have here an instance of strong *vav* with the perfect. Nam celantes torquebit et tradidit = ואתה מסתירים יונה נתן. Previous editors emend tradidit into tradet. If we must change, we should probably read tradibit(?).

3. *Deis donabuntur (in) gentibus.* MS. diisdonabuntur gentibus. So Merx, but that he

reads dominis instead of deis. Haupt, disdonabuntur (= διαδοθῆσονται) gentibus.

Medicis. MS. adds pueri, which I omit, with Schmidt-Merx and Fritzsche.

Secabuntur. Schmidt-Merx add et venabuntur.

Inducere acrobistiam. MS. inducere acrosisam.

5. *Novissime post haec.* These two expressions may have arisen from two alternative renderings of the same Hebrew word or phrase.

Leges et. MS. et leges. This is the simplest and, so far as I

duci vinctos in cus
 3 todiam et uxores
 eorum diis donabun-
 tur gentibus.
 Et filii eorum pueri
 secabantur a medicis
 pueri inducere ac
 4 rosisam illis nam illi
 in eis punientur in
 tormentis et igne
 et ferro et cogen-
 tur palam bajulare
 idola eorum iniqui
 nata quomodo sunt
 pariter continen-
 5 tibus ea et a torquen-
 tibus illos pariter co-
 gentur intrare in
 abditum locum eo-
 rum et cogentur

b stimulis blasfema
 re verbum contu-
 meliose novissime
 post haec et leges
 quod haberent su-
 pra altarium suum
 IX. tunc illo dicente ho-
 mo de tribu leui
 cujus nomen erit
 taxo qui habens vii
 filios dicens ad eos
 2 rogans videte filii
 ecce ultio facta est
 in plebe altera cru-
 delis immunda et
 traductio sine mi-
 sericordia et emi-
 nent principatum
 3 quae enim gens aut
 quae regio aut quis

see, the most satisfactory emen-
 dation of the text. Hilgenfeld
 emends leges into legis, and
 takes it as genitive dependent
 on quod. Volkmar changes quod
 into quas. Schmidt-Merx would
 omit et leges or read et legis
 (latorem et). Fritzsche reads et
 leges et.

IX. 1. *Die erit.* So Schmidt-
 Merx, from dicente. Volkmar,
 edicenti; Hilgenfeld, ducente.

Dicit. MS. dicens.

Traductio = ἐλεγχος. Cf. Wis-
 dom ii. 14, xi. 8, xviii. 5
 (Rönsch).

2. *Eminens principatum* = ὑπε-
 ρέχων τὴν ἀρχήν. So Rönsch and
 Hilgenfeld, from eminent prin-
 cipatum. Schmidt-Merx and
 Fritzsche, clementia principa-
 tum.

3. *Dominum.* So Hilgenfeld.
 MS. domum.

mala passi sunt, quanta nobis contegerunt? 4. Nunc ergo, filii, audite me; videte enim et scite, quia nunquam temptan(te)s Deum, nec parentes (nostri), nec proavi eorum, ut praetereant mandata Illius. 5. Scitis enim quia haec sunt vires nobis. Et hoc faciemus. 6. Jejunemus triduo, et quarto die intremus in speluncam quae est in agro est, et moriamur potius, quam praetereamus mandata Domini Domimorum, Dei parentum nostrorum. 7. Hoc enim si faciemus et moriemur, sanguis noster vindicabitur coram Domino.

X. Et tunc parebit regnum illius in omni creatura
Illius

Et tunc Zabulus finem habebit,
Et tristitia cum eo abducetur.

2. Tunc implebuntur manus nuntii,
Qui erit in summo constitutus,
Qui protinus vindicabit illos ab inimicis eorum.
3. (Exur)get enim Caelestis a sede regni sui,
Et exiet de habitatione sancta sua

4. *Nunquam temptantes Deum, nec parentes (nostri), nec proavi eorum.* I have here added *nostri* with Schmidt-Merx, and emended *temptans* of the MS. into *temptantes*, as Volkmar. The construction is purely Semitic. The clause = the Hebrew אֵינָם מְטַמְּתִים אֶת־אֱלֹהִים נָם אֲבוֹתֵינוּ נָם אֲבוֹתֵינוּ. The Aramaic is similar, לִיתְנִן מְטַמְּתִין יְהוָה. Hilgenfeld's emendation of *temptans* into *temp-*

tavimus is a strong measure, and is likewise against the context. The speaker is urging his sons to do as their fathers before them, who never tempted God nor transgressed His commandments. And so, in ver. 7, he urges them to die rather than transgress.

5. *Faciemus.* Hilgenfeld emends into *faciamus*.

6. *Speluncam.* MS. *spelunca*.

- populus impiorum
in domum qui multa
scelestia fecerunt
tanta mala passi sunt
- 91^a quanta nobis contegerunt
- 4 Nunc ergo filii audite
me videte enim et
scite quia nunquam
temptans deum nec pa-
rentes nec proavi
eorum ut praetere-
ant mandata illius
- 5 scitis enim quia haec
sunt vires nobis
- 6 et hoc faciemus jeju-
nemus triduo et
quarto die intremus
in spelunca quae in
agro est et moria-
mur potius quam
praetereamus man-
data domini dominorum dei
- parentum nostro-
rum hoc enim si fa-
ciemus et morie-
mur sanguis nos-
ter vindicabitur
- b coram domino
- X. Et tunc parebit reg-
num illius in omni
creatura illius
Et tunc zabulus finem
habebit et tristitiam
cum eo adducetur
- 2 Tunc implebuntur
manus nuntii qui
est in summo cons-
titutus qui proti-
nus vindicavit illos
ab inimicis eorum
- 3 get enim caeles-
tis a sede regni sui
et exiet de habita-
tione sancta sua cum

7. *Vindicabitur.* MS. vindi-
cavitur.

X. 1. *Zabulus, i.e.* diabolus.
This form is frequent in the
Latin fathers. Cf. Lactant. *De*
mort. pers. XVI., a te Zabulus
victus est.

Tristitia. MS. tristitiam.

Abducetur. So Hilgenfeld and

Volkmar, from adducetur.
Schmidt-Merx, deducetur.

2. *Implebuntur manus.* The
phrase *יד כלא* means, to give full
powers to.

Erit. MS. est.

Vindicabit. MS. vindicavit.

3. *Cum indignationem et*
iram. For the emendation of

† Cum indignationem et iram † propter filios
suos :

4. Et tremebit terra, usque ad fines suas concutietur,

Et alti montes humiliabuntur

Et colles concutientur et cadent.

5. (Et) cornua solis confringentur et in tenebras convertet se,

Et luna non dabit lumen et tota convertet se in sanguinem,

Et orbis stellarum conturbabitur.

6. Et mare usque ad abyssum decedet,

Et fontes aquarum deficient,

Et flumina exarescent ;

this corrupt text, see exegetical note on X. 3.

4. Schmidt-Merx bracket concutietur et.

Et alti montes humiliabuntur = καὶ τὰ ὑψηλὰ ταπεινωθήσεται. This phrase is ultimately derived from Isa. xl. 4, probably through Eth. En. i. 5.

Et colles concutientur et cadent. The MS. is here impossible: et concutientur et convalles cadent. In the first place, it would be absurd to speak of the mountains being shaken after they had already been brought low ; and in the next, the valleys cannot be described as falling. Convalles is clearly wrong, and if we turn to Isa. xl. 4, πᾶν ὄρος καὶ βουνὸς ταπεινωθήσεται, and Eth. En. i. 6, καὶ σεισθήσονται καὶ πεσοῦνται καὶ διαλυθήσονται

ὄρη ὑψηλὰ καὶ ταπεινωθήσονται βουνοὶ ὑψηλοὶ (Greek Version), on which the present passage is based, we shall see that convalles should be colles, and that concutientur should be connected with cadent. So Eth. En. i. 6, σεισθήσονται καὶ πεσοῦνται. This corruption might possibly have arisen in the Latin. It is easy to explain it as a confusion of מַצְבֵּי with מַבְּעֵי.

5. (Et) cornua solis . . . in sanguinem. The MS. reads, sol non dabit lumen et in tenebris convertent se cornua lunae et confringentur et tota convertit se in sanguine, which Hilgenfeld follows, merely changing convertit into convertet. This verse is clearly corrupt. Fritzsche emended tenebris convertent into tenebras convertet, convertit in-

indignationem et
 iram propter filios
 4 suos et tremebit
 terra usque ad fi
 nes suas concutie
 tur et alti montes
 humiliabuntur
 92^a et concutientur
 et convalles cadent

5 sol non dabit lumen
 et in tenebris con
 vertent se cornua
 lunae et confringen
 tur et tota conver
 tit se in sanguine et
 orbis stellarum con
 6 turvavitur et ma
 re usque ad abyssum

to convertet, and omits et before confringentur. Schmidt-Merx deal drastically with the text. They omit et in tenebris convertent se and et tota convertit se in sanguine as marginal glosses from Acts ii. 20. But they failed to remark that Joel ii. 31 is the source of these phrases, and not Acts ii. 20. They further object (and I believe rightly) to the expression cornua lunae, and think that cornua belongs to sol. Hence they read: et cornua solis confringentur et luna non dabit lumen. It is not necessary, however, to delete the above phrases. They are well-known O.T. expressions. This, indeed, might favour the idea of their being glosses, but the fact that their removal would destroy the vigour of the text makes for their retention. Hence the text requires to be dealt with differently. First of all, in tenebras convertet se is a phrase nearly always used of the sun. Cf. Eccles. xii. 2; Isa. xiii. 10; Joel ii. 31, iii. 15; Mt. xxiv. 29; Mk. xiii. 24; Lk. xxiii. 45; Acts ii. 20; Rev.

vi. 12, ix. 2. Hence we have good grounds for connecting it with the sun in this passage, against the MS., which relates it to the moon. Secondly, the phrase non dabit lumen is not used of the sun, but of the moon only. Cf. Ezek. xxxii. 7; Mt. xxiv. 29; Mk. xiii. 24. This may be due to the paranomasia in the phrase in Hebrew: יִרְחָ לֹא יִתֵּן אֹרֶךְ. Thirdly, tota convertet se in sanguinem is only used of the moon: Joel ii. 31; Acts ii. 20; Rev. vi. 12. Finally, I accept Merx's view that cornua confringentur must be connected with sol. Hence the passage should read—

(Et) cornua solis confringentur
 et in tenebras convertet
 se
 Et luna non dabit lumen
 et tota convertet se in san
 guinem.
Conturbabitur. MS. contur
 vavitur.

6. *Decedet.* MS. decedit.

Et fontes. MS. ad fontes.

Exarescent. So Haupt, from MS. expavescent. Cf. Test. Levi iv. ὑδάτων ξηραυμένων.

7. Quia exurget Summus, Deus aeternus solus,
Et palam veniet ut vindicet gentes,
Et perdet omnia idola eorum.
8. Tunc felix eris tu Istrahel,
Et ascendes supra cervices [et alas] aquilae,
Et implebuntur (dies luctus tui).
9. Et altabit te Deus,
Et faciet te herere caelo stellarum,
† Loco habitationis eorum †:
10. Et conspicias a summo et videbis inimicos
tuos in Ge(henna),
Et cognosces illos et gaudebis,
Et ages gratias et confiteberis creatori tuo.
11. Nam tu, Jesu Nave, custodi verba haec et
hunc librum. 12. Erunt enim a morte—receptione
—m(ea) usque ad adventum illius tempora CCL quae
fient. 13. Et hic cursus (erit) horum quem con-
venient donec consummentur. 14. Ego autem ad
dormitionem patrum meorum eam. 15. Itaque tu,
Jesu Nave, (confortare, et) firma te (nam te) elegit
Deus esse mihi successorem ejusdem testamenti.

7. *Exurget.* MS. *exurgit.*
Aeternus solus. Schmidt-Merx
transpose after *deus* in ver. 9.

8. *Implebuntur.* In the la-
cuna already recognised by Merx
and Fritzsche, following Dr.
Cheyne's apt suggestion, I have
supplied *dies luctus tui* from
Isa. lx. 20, where the context,
as he points out, deals with
Israel's glorious future on earth.

9. *Altabit.* MS. *altavit.*
Faciet te herere. *Herere, i.e.*
haerere = *κολλᾶσθαι*, which may
be a rendering of נָחַץ or נָחַץ (Job
xli. 16).

9-10. *Loco habitationis eorum.*
For my emendation of this cor-
rupt text, see exegetical note on
X. 9. Schmidt-Merx think the
words are transposed, and write
them as follows: *et videbis*

- decedit ad fontes
 aquarum deficient
 et flumina expaves
 7 cent' quia exurgit
 summus deus aeternus
 solus et palam ve
 niet ut vindicet gen
 tes et perdet om
 nia idola eorum
 8 Tunc felix eris tu is
 trahel et ascendes
 supra cervices et
 alas aquilae et in
 b 9 plebuntur et alta
 vit te deus et faciet te
 herere caelo stella
 rum loco habitatio
 10 nis eorum' et cons
 pices a summo et vi
 des inimicos tuos
 in terram et cognos
 ces illos et gaudebis
 et agis gratias et con
 fiteberis creatori
 11 tuo nam tu jesu na
 ue custodi verba
 haec et hunc librum
 12 erunt enim a morte
 receptionem usque
 ad adventum illius
 tempora 'cel' quae
 13 fiunt *et hic* cursus
 . . . horum quem
 conveniunt donec
 consummentur
 14 Ego autem ad dormi
 tionem patrum me
 100a 15 orum eram itaque

inimicos tuos in terra et conspicias a summo locos habitationis eorum.

10. *Conspicies.* MS. conspices. *Videbis.* MS. vides. *Ge(henna).* So I emend and restore the corrupt text terram. See exegetical note on X. 10 for the grounds for so doing. *Agis.* MS. agis.

11. *Nam.* Hilgenfeld, jam.

12. *A morte — receptione — m(ea).* Volkmar and Fritzsche, a morte et receptione mea; Hilgen-

feld, a morte mea; Schmidt-Merx, a receptione mea = ἀπὸ τῆς ἐμῆς ἀναλήψεως.

Fient. So Hilgenfeld, from MS. fiunt.

13. *Convenient.* MS. conveniunt. This is a peculiar use of this word. Rönisch thinks that it represents μεθοδεύουσιν. Fritzsche emends into conficient.

14. *Eam.* So all editors, from eram.

15. (*Confortare et*) *firma te*

XI. Et cum audisset Jesus verba Moysi tam scripta in sua scriptura (quam) omnia quae praedixerat, scidit sibi vestimenta et procidit ad pedes Monse. 2. Et hortatus est eum Monse et ploravit cum eo. 3. Et respondit illi et dixit Jesus: 4. "Quid me solaris, domine Monse? et quo genere solabor de qua locutus es voce acerba quae exivit de ore tuo, quae est plena lacrimis et gemitibus, quia tu discedis de plebe ist(a)? 5. (Sed ec)quis locus recipiet (jam) te? 6. Aut quod erit monumentum sepulturae? 7. Aut quis audebit corpus tuum transferre inde ut homo de loco in locum? 8. Omnibus enim morientibus secus aetatem sepulturae suae sunt in terris; nam tua sepultura ab oriente sole usque ad occidentem et ab austro usque ad fines aquilonis: omnis orbis terrarum

(*nam te*). So I have restored with Schmidt-Merx. For *firma* the MS. reads *forma*. The text here unquestionably goes back to the phrase with which Moses addressed Joshua in Deut. xxxi. 6, 7, 23; Josh. i. 6, 7. See critical note on I. 10. This phrase is of frequent occurrence later, 1 Chron. xix. 13, xxii. 13, xxviii. 20; 2 Chron. xxxii. 7; Dan. x. 19, xi. 1; 1 Macc. ii. 64; 1 Cor. xvi. 13.

For *forma* Hilgenfeld reads *firma*, presumably meaning *firmare*; Volkmar, *firma te*.

XI. 1. *Moysi* = Μωϋσή.

Tam. Volkmar adds *dicta* quam.

(*Quam*). I have added *quam* after *scriptura*; Schmidt-Merx and Fritzsche add it after *omnia*. Hilgenfeld makes no addition, but takes *tam* = ὅτι.

Praedixerat. MS. *praedixerant*.

Monse. MS. gives *meos*. Schmidt-Merx, *Mose*; but see crit. note on III. 11. Volkmar, *Moysis*; Hilgenfeld, *Mosis*.

2. *Hortatus est* = παρακάλει.

Eum. So Rönsch, Hilgenfeld and Schmidt-Merx, from *cum*. *Monse*. MS. *Monse*. Fritzsche; *Moyses*.

4. *Solaris* . . . *solabor*. So Schmidt-Merx and Hilgenfeld, from MS. *celares* . . . *celabor*.

100^a tu jesu naue forma te
elegit deus esse mihi
successorem ejusdem

XI. testamenti et cum
audisset jesus verba
moysi tam scripta
in sua scriptura om
nia quae praedixerant
scidit sibi vestimen
ta et procidit ad pe

2 des meos et horta
tus est cum monse
et ploravit cum eo
3 Et respondit illi et
4 dixit iesus quid me ce
lares domine monse
et quo genere cela
bor de qua locutus
est voce acerva que
exivit de ore tuo
quae est plena la

crimis et gemitibus
quia tu discedis de

b plebe ist

5 quis locus recipit

6 te aut quod erit mo
numentum sepul

7 turae aut quis aude
vit corpus tuum trans
ferre in eut homo
de loco in locum

8 Omnibus enim mori
entibus secus aeta
tem sepulturae su
ae sunt in terris
nam tua sepultura
ab oriente sole usque
ad occidentem et
ab austro usque ad fi
nes aquilonis omnis
orbis terrarum se
pulerum est tuum

Volkmar, zelar^{is} . . . zelabor.
Quid me solar^{is} . . . solabor=
τι με παρεκαλ^{εις} και τι^{νι} τ^{ρο}πω
παρακληθ^ησομαι = ל^מא נחמ^{ני} ו^אי' א^תנח^ם

De quo. Volkmar, Schmidt-
Merx, and Fritzsche emend into
de qua.

Es. MS. est.

Acerba quae. MS. acerva que.

5. Ist(a. Sed ec)quis. So I

restore. Hilgenfeld ist(a modo);
Volkmar, ist(a multa); Schmidt-
Merx, ist(a et jam); Fritzsche,
ist(a verum).

Recipiet (jam). So I restore
with Fritzsche. Hilgenfeld, re-
cipiendi; Schmidt-Merx, re-
cipiet (nunc).

7. Audebit. MS. audevit.
Inde ut. So Gutschmidt, from
in eut.

sepulcrum est tuum. 9. Domine, abis, et quis nutriet plebem istam? 10. Aut quis est qui miserebitur illis, et quis eis dux erit in via? 11. Aut quis orabit pro eis, nec patiens ne unum quidem diem, ut inducam illos in terram atavorum? 12. Quomodo ergo potero plebem hanc tanquam pater unicum filium, aut tanquam domina filiam virginem, quae paratur dari viro, quem timebit, corpus custodiens ejus a sole et ne (sint) scalciati pedes ejus ad currendum supra terram. 13. (Et quí) [de voluntate eorum] praestabo illis ciborum et potui secus voluptatem voluntatis eorum? 14.

9. *Abis.* So Schmidt-Merx and Hilgenfeld, from ab his.

Nutriet. MS. nutrit.

11. *Nec patiens ne unum diem* = οὐδὲ παριέις οὐδεμίαν ἡμέραν. Now παριέις = "permitting" or "omitting." The Latin translator wrongly followed the former meaning. Hence for patiens read praetermittens. Hence there is no need to suppose a confusion of πάσχω and παρήσχω with Fritzsche, or regard patiens as a corruption of fatiscens with Schmidt-Merx. For unum, MS. reads uno.

Diem. Hilgenfeld and Schmidt-Merx change into die.

Atavorum. So Rönsch, from araborum. Cf. I. 8. Schmidt-Merx, abavorum; Ewald, Amorreorum.

12. *Potero plebem hanc.* This I take to be = δυναστεύσω τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον = הוה עבד לך. δυναστεύειν is a rendering of

לָעַבַד in the LXX., and in 1 Chron. xvi. 21 and Dan. xi. 4 governs an accusative. Here, as in ver. 11, we have to render not the Latin word before us, but the Greek, which it presupposes. In ver. 17 we have to resolve the difficulty similarly.

For ergo potero, Hilgenfeld first suggested regere potero, then ego potero. He also suggests that potero may be corrupt for procuro. Volkmar thinks that potero = δυνήσομαι, which is corrupt for ἡγήσομαι or ὀδηγήσομαι. According to Rönsch (*Z.f. W.T.* 1868, p. 105), potero = δυνατήσω or δυναστεύσω; (*Z.f. W.T.* 1869, pp. 226-228), δυνήσομαι or δυναστεύσω.

Domina filiam virginem. So I emend filiam dominam virginem. Volkmar took κυρίαν = begotten of his own body, but this is impossible. Merx reads filia dominam virginem. Fritzsche, filiam domina virgi-

9 domine ab his
 Et quis nutrit plebem
 10 istam aut quis est
 qui miserebitur il
 lis et quis eis dux erit
 99^a in via aut quis ora
 bit pro eis nec pati
 ens ne uno quidem
 diem ut inducam il
 los in terram ara
 12 borum quomodo
 ergo potero plebem
 hanc tanquam pa
 ter unicum filium
 aut tanquam filiam

dominam virginem
 quae paratur tali vi
 ro quae timebat cor
 pus custodiet ejus
 a sole et ne scalcia
 ti pedes ejus ad cur
 13 rendum supra ter
 ram de vo
 luntatem eorum
 praestabo illis ci
 borum et potui se
 cus voluntatem
 voluntatis eorum
 14 enim illorum
 b erant c milia nam

nem. If we could reject the second tanquam, we might then take dominam to be a rendering of *κυρία*, and this in turn to be a corruption of *ὥπαια*. The sense then would be admirable, "as a father (his) only son or his comely virgin-daughter."

Dari viro. So I emend tali viro. Cf. Eccclus. vii. 25, ἐκδοῦ θυγατέρα . . . καὶ ἀνδρὶ συνεψῶ δάμνησαι αὐτήν. These words were most probably before the writer, as he has clearly drawn upon vii. 24, πρόσεχε τῷ σώματι αὐτῶν. Volkmar reads (nup)t(i)-ali viro; Schmidt-Merx, thalamo viri; Rönsch, tradi viro.

Quem timebat. So Rönsch, from quae timebat, comparing Eccclus. xxvi. 28 (MSS. H., 248 ;

Syr. Vers. and Arab.), which seems to have been in the mind of the writer: θυγάτηρ δὲ εὐσχήμων καὶ τὸν ἀνδρα ἐντραπήσεται. Rönsch thus restores the Greek παρθένον παρασκευαζομένην ἐκδοθῆναι ἀνδρὶ δὲ ἐντραπήσεται.

13. (*Et qui*). So Volkmar and Schmidt-Merx supply the lacuna; Hilgenfeld, quid.

[*De voluntate eorum*]. I have bracketed this phrase as a ditto-graphy.

Secus voluptatem voluntatis eorum = כהפך רצונם. Cf. Ephes. i. 5. MS. secus voluntatem voluntatis eorum. Other editors read secus voluntatem voluptatis eorum.

14. [*Viri*]. So Hilgenfeld supplies the lacuna, comparing

(Viri) enim illorum erunt (D)C milia, nam isti in tantum increverunt in tuis orationibus, domine Monse. 15. Et quae est mihi sapientia aut intellectus in domo (Domini) verbis aut judicare aut respondere? 16. Sed et reges Amorreorum tum audebunt expugnare nos, (et) credentes jam non esse † semet † sacrum spiritum dignum Domino, multiplicem et incompraehensibilem, dominum verbi, fidelem in omnia, divinum per orbem terrarum profetem, consummatum in saeculo doctorem jam non esse in eis, dicent: 'Eamus ad eos. 17. Si inimici impie fecerunt semel adhuc in

Exod. xii. 37; Volkmar, copia; Schmidt-Merx, numerus.

Erunt. So Fritzsche, from erant.

(D) I have supplied from Exod. xii. 37.

Increverunt. So Hilgenfeld, from qui creverunt. Rönsch emends qui into quidem. Hence in tantum quidem = *eis τοσοῦτον τι*.

15. (*Domini*). So, rightly, former editors supply the lacuna in the MS.

16. *Tum audebunt expugnare nos.* So I emend cum audierint expugnare nos. This, I think, gives the right sense to expugnare nos, making nos the object of expugnare. This thought is put into the mouths of the Amorites at the close of the verse: eamus ad eos. Schmidt-Merx add audebunt after audierint: cum audierint audebunt expugnare nos.

Non esse semet. Hilgenfeld takes semet = *ἐαυτὸν*, corrupt for *ἐαυτῶν*. Hence non esse semet is derived from *οὐκέτι εἶναι ἐαυτῶν* = "was no longer amongst them." Volkmar regards semet = *αὐτόν*, corrupt for *αὐτόν*, i.e. Moses. Wieseler emends it into semel, Schmidt-Merx into semen, and Rönsch into senem. Schmidt-Merx supply in eis before semen. Semet is corrupt, I think, for secum = *σὺν αὐτοῖς*, a miswriting of *σὺν αὐτοῖς*. Thus non esse cum eis is the same practically as the phrase at the close of the verse, non esse in eis.

Jam non esse in eis. Schmidt-Merx brackets. *Dicent.* MS. dicens.

17. *Inimici.* Schmidt-Merx, enim ei.

Quomodo Monse ferebat magnus nuntius. So I emend quomodo Monse erat magnus

isti in tantum qui
 creverunt in tuis
 orationibus domine mon
 15 se et quae est mihi
 sapientia aut intelle
 lectus in domo
 verbis aut judicare
 aut respondere
 16 sed et reges amor
 reorum cum audie
 rint expugnare nos
 credentes jam non
 esse semet sacrum

spiritum dignum domino
 multiplicem et in
 conpraehensibilem
 dominum verbi fidelem
 in omnia divinum
 per orbem terra
 rum profetam con
 summatum in sae
 culo doctorem jam
 non esse in eis di
 98^a cens Eamus ad e
 17 os si inimici impie
 fecerunt semel ad

nuntius; for the reading of the MS. does not give the sense required by the context. The words quomodo Moses erat must be connected either with non est defensor: "they have no advocate like unto Moses"; or with qui ferat pro eis praeces: "to offer prayers for them as Moses offered." If we pursue the latter course, we must emend erat into ferebat. Then quomodo Monses ferebat praeces will = כַּאֲשֶׁר מֹשֶׁה נִשָּׂא הַפְּלוֹת. This I have done above. But the latter course may be preferable. "No advocate like Moses" is more suitable to the context. Hence the error originated with the Greek translator, who misrendered כַּמֹּשֶׁה הַמְּלָאךְ הַגָּדוֹל = "like unto Moses the great messenger." Previous editors have failed to remark this difficulty.

Intuens potentem omnis orbis terrarum cum misericordia. The MS. gives the corrupt text, intuens homini potentem orbem terrarum cum misericordia. First of all, cum misericordia is clearly an adverbial phrase qualifying potentem. Hence potentem is to be regarded as a participle governing orbem and qualified by cum misericordia. It is thus obvious that homini cannot be compounded with it. It can only then belong to orbem terrarum. Hence we must read either omnem orbem terrarum or omnis orbis terrarum. The text thus runs: intuens potentem omnis orbis terrarum cum misericordia = ἐμβλέπων εἰς τὸν δυναστεύοντα παντὸς τοῦ κόσμου ἐν ἐλεημοσύνῃ = שׁוֹעָה עַל הַמּוֹשֵׁל הַמְּלָאךְ הַגָּדוֹל בְּרַחֲמִים. See note on potero in XI. 12. For Greek expressions justifying the above,

Dominum suum, non est defensor illis qui ferat pro eis praeceps Domino, quomodo Monse ferebat magnus nuntius, qui singulis horis, diebus et noctibus, habebat genua sua infixata in terra, orans et intuens potentem omnis orbis terrarum cum misericordia et iustitia, reminiscens testamentum parentum et jurejurando placando Dominum.' 18. Dicent enim: 'Non est cum eis: eamus itaque et confundamus eos a facie terrae.' 19. Quod ergo fiet plebi isti, domine Monse?"

XII. Et postquam finivit verba Jesus, iterum procidit ad pedes Monse. 2. Et Monse prendit manum ipsius et erexit illum in cathedra ante se, et respondit et dixit illi: 3. "Jesu, te ne contemnas, sed praebe te securum et adtende verbis meis. 4. Omnes gentes quae sunt in orbe terrarum Deus

cf. 3 Macc. ii. 7, τῷ τῆς ἀπάσης κτίσεως δυναστεύοντι; v. 7, τὸν . . . πάσης δυνάμεως δυναστεύοντα; Ezra viii. 13, ὁ τὰ πάντα δυναστεύων θεός.

Previous editors tried many ways of emendation, of which the best are: Hilgenfeld, intuens omnipotentem orbem terrarum, which, he thinks, implies εἰσορῶν τὸν πάντα κρατοῦντα τὸν κόσμον. Is this conceivable? Schmidt-Merx, intuens omni potent(ia tenent)em orbem terrarum = ἀτενίσας παντὶ σθένει κτλ. = Aramaic, חסא בכל חיל חסא עלמא לוח אֶתְּרָא. It is possible that omnem does not belong to the text at all. It may have

arisen from the corruption of *ly* into *ly*.

Reminiscens = ἀναμνήσκων. So Rönisch points out (*Z.f. W.T.* 1874, p. 562).

Placando = placans. See critical note on accipiendo poenas in V. 5.

18. *Confundamus*. We must here translate, not the Latin word, but the Greek συγχέωμεν, which it implies.

Facie. MS. faciae.

XII. 2. *Monse*. MS. Monse.

3. *Iesu te ne*. So Hilgenfeld, from Iesus et ne. Schmidt-Merx, Iesu, set ne.

4. *Orbe*. MS. ore.

Ut nos. So Rönisch, from

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>huc in dominum suum
non est defensor
illis qui ferat pro
eis praeces domino
quomodo monse
erat magnus nunti
us qui singulis horis
diebus et noctibus ha
bebat genua sua in
fixa in terra orans
et intuens homini
potentem orbem
terrarum cum mi
sericordia et jus
titia reminiscens
testamentum pa
rentum et jure
jurando placando</p> <p>18 dominum dicent enim
non est ille cum eis</p> | <p>eamus itaque et con
b fundamus eos a fa
ciae terrae quod
19 ergo fiet plebi isti
XII. domine monse et post
quam finivit ver
ba iesus iterum pro
cidit ad pedes monsi
2 Et monse prendit
manum ipsius et e
rexit illum in cathe
dra ante se Et res
pondit et dixit illi
3 iesus et ne contem
nas sed praebe te
securum et adten
4 de verbis meis om
nes gentes quae sunt
in ore terrarum
deus creavit et nos</p> |
|--|--|

et nos. Schmidt-Merx, (illos)
et nos. Hilgenfeld connects
nos with praevit. Schmidt-
Merx omit the following illos
et nos.

Usque ad. So Gutschmidt,
from ut ad.

Praevit et promovit cuncta.
So I emend praevit et provovit
cum eis; for in connection with
praevit we require another
verb expressive of action, as

in the preceding words, creavit
. . . praevit, and in the clause
immediately subsequent, provi
dit et ecce auferitur (*i.e.* affertur).
Foreknowledge and action, or
thought and actuality, are one
in the divine mind.

Volkmar reads praevit et
pronovit cum eis; Schmidt-
Merx, praenovit et provovit
cunctis; Hilgenfeld, praevit
et pronovit cunctis.

creavit ut nos, praevidit illos et nos ab initio creaturae orbis terrarum usque ad exitum saeculi, et nihil est ab eo neglectum usque ad pusillum, sed omnia praevidit et promovit cuncta. 5. (Et) Dominus omnia quae futura essent in hoc orbe terrarum providit et ecce affertur (in lucem. 6. Dominus) me constituit pro eis ut pro peccatis eorum (orarem) et in(plorare(m) pro eis. 7. Non enim propter meam virtutem aut [in]firmitatem, sed temperantius misericordiae ipsius et patientia contegerunt mihi. 8. Dico enim tibi, Jesu: Non propter pietatem plebis hujus exterminabis gentes. 9. Lumina caeli fundamenta orbis facta et probata a Deo et sub annulo dexteræ Illius sunt. 10.

5. (Et). Volkmar and Hilgenfeld supply the lacuna with deus; Fritzsche, with ut.

Affertur. So Volkmar, from aufertur.

5-6. (In lucem . . . Dominus), i.e. in lucem dñs. So I supply the lacuna, but there seems to be a large gap here in the work, though the MS. gives no hint of it. Hilgenfeld (itaque Dmñ)s; Volkmar (sic dñs dmñ)s.

6. Ut. Volkmar, from et. (Orarem). So supplied by Volkmar.

Im(pl)orare(m). So Rönsch. Volkmar in(pr)ecare(r).

7. [In]firmitatem. I have bracketed the in as an intrusion: the context requires this. Schmidt - Merx, in firmitate mea.

Temperantius. Over against non propter meam virtutem aut firmitatem we expect an expression of God's will or purpose: not my worth, but God's purpose or call. Now, if we re-translate our text into Hebrew, we shall find that the Hebrew thus arrived at furnishes the meaning we are in search of. First of all, temperantius = ἐπιεικῶς. Now, in the only two passages in the canonical books of the LXX. where ἐπιεικῶς occurs, it is a translation of יָאֵל. 1 Sam. xii. 22, ἐπιεικῶς κύριος προσελάβοτο ὑμᾶς ἐναντὶ ἐλς λαβν = הוֹאֵל יי לעשות אתכם לו לעם; and 2 Kings vi. 3, καὶ εἶπεν ὁ εἰς ἐπιεικῶς δεῦρο = וַיֹּאמֶר הַחֹדֶר הוֹאֵל נָא וְלך. Thus temperantius misericordiae ipsius, . . . , contigerunt

praevidit illos et
nos ab initio crea-
turae orbis terra-
rum ut ad exitum
saeculi et nihil est

97^a ab eo neglectum us-
que ad pusillum
sed omnia praevidit
et provovit cum

5 *eis* . . *dns* omnia quae
futura essent in *hoc*
orbe terrarum pro-
vidit et ecce aufer-
tur

6 . . . s *me* consti-
tuit pro eis et pro pec-
catis eorum . . .
. . . et in . . *ccare* . .

7 pro eis non enim

propter meam vir-
tutem aut infirmi-
tatem sed tempe-
rantius misericor-
diae ipsius et pati-
entia contegerunt

8 mihi dico enim ti-
bi iesu non propter
pietatem plebis hu-
jus exterminabis

b 9 gentes omnia *caeli*
firmamenta orbis *fac*-
ta ut provata a deo
et sub nullo dexte-
rae illius sunt

10 Facientes itaque et con-
summantes manda-
ta ei crescunt et bo-
nam viam exigunt

. mihi = ἐπιεικῶς συνέβη μοι ἔλεος
αὐτοῦ = הוּאִיל וְקָרָא אֹתִי חֲסִדוֹ. Here
we must either change וְקָרָא into
הִקְרִיא, and translate "He was
pleased to make his compassion
light upon me," or else insert
בִּ or ב before חֲסִדוֹ, and then we
have, "He was pleased to call
me in His compassion" = dig-
natus est vocare me in miseri-
cordia ipsius.

Patientia. We should add
ipsius.

9. *Lumina.* So Hilgenfeld,

from omnia. *Fundamenta.* So
Hilgenfeld, from firmanenta.
Schmidt-Merx read, omnia enim
fundamenta orbis.

Et probata. MS. ut provata.
Annulo. So Gutschmidt,
from nullo. Rönsch compares
Jer. xxii. 24, ἀποσφράγισμα
(חותם) ἐπὶ τῆς χειρὸς τῆς δεξιᾶς
μου, Eccclus. xlix. 11. Schmidt-
Merx propose umbra.

10. *Crescent . . . exigent.* So
Schmidt-Merx, from crescunt
. . . exigunt.

Facientes itaque et consummantes mandata Dei
crescent et bonam vitam exigent: 11. Nam
peccantibus et neglegentibus mandata carebunt bona
quae praedicta sunt, et punientur a gentibus multis
tormentis: 12. Nam (ut) in totum exterminet et
extinguat eos fieri non potest. 13. Exhibit enim
Deus qui praevidit omnia in saecula, et stabilitum
est testamentum Illius et jusjurandum quod

11. <i>Carebunt bona.</i>	So	12. (<i>Ut</i>).	Added by Volkmar
Fritzsche, from <i>carere bonam.</i>		and Schmidt-Merx.	
Volkmar, <i>carent bona ea.</i>		<i>Extinguat.</i>	So I emend relin-

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>11 nam peccantibus et
neglegentibus man
data carere bonam
quae praedicta sunt
Et punientur a gen
tibus multis tormen
12 tis nam in totum ex
terminet et relin</p> | <p>quat eos fieri non
13 potest exivit enim
deus qui praevidit om
nia in saecula et sta
bilitum est testa
mentum illius et
jurejurando quod</p> |
|--|---|

quat, which has no meaning
after exterminet.

13. *Exibit.* So Volkmar and
Schmidt-Merx, from exivit.

Jusjurandum. MS. jure-
jurando.

ORIGINAL ASSUMPTION
OF MOSES

ORIGINAL ASSUMPTION OF MOSES

WE have already seen in the Introduction (pp. xlv-l) good grounds for regarding the Latin Fragment, *i.e.* the so-called Assumption of Moses, as constituting originally not "The Assumption," but "The Testament of Moses." We further learnt that this Fragment shows traces of editing, by means of which this Testament was adapted to and combined with another document. For the leading characteristic of this latter document we are already prepared through the insertion in X. 12, which shows that it was the editor's intention to add to the "Testament" thus edited "The Assumption of Moses." Of this original Assumption of Moses, thus foreshadowed in X. 12, not a single line has survived in the Latin Fragment; but it is not entirely lost to us, for some of its most remarkable passages have been preserved in Greek in St. Jude and several of the patristic writers. From these scattered quotations and references we are able in some degree to restore the order of its thought, and in part its actual phraseology in one or more of its most important sections.

Now, judging from the surviving Greek fragments, which we shall give *in extenso* presently, the order of

the action in the original Assumption was probably as follows:—

- i. Michael is commissioned to bury Moses:
- ii. Satan opposes his burial, and that on two grounds—
(a) First, he claims to be the lord of matter (hence the body rightfully should be handed over to him).

To this claim Michael rejoins: "The Lord rebuke thee, for it was God's Spirit that created the world and all mankind." (Hence not Satan, but God was the Lord of matter.) (b) Secondly, Satan brings the charge of murder against Moses. (The answer to this charge is wanting.)

iii. Having rebutted Satan's accusations, Michael then proceeds to charge Satan with having inspired the serpent to tempt Adam and Eve.

iv. Finally, all opposition having been overcome, the Assumption takes place in the presence of Joshua and Caleb, and in a very peculiar way. A twofold presentation of Moses appears: one is Moses "living in the spirit," which is carried up to heaven; the other is the dead body of Moses, which is buried in the recesses of the mountains.

This sketch is founded, as we have observed, on quotations and references occurring in St. Jude and subsequent writers. We shall now reproduce it in the actual phraseology of these writers.

i. τελευτήσαντος ἐν τῷ ὄρει Μωυσέως ὁ ἀρχάγγελος Μιχαὴλ ἀποστέλλεται μεταθήσων τὸ σῶμα.

ii. Ὁ οὖν διάβολος ἀντεῖχε θέλων ἀπατήσαι, λέγων ὅτι·
(a) "Ἐμὸν ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα, ὡς τῆς ὕλης δεσπόζοντι." ὁ δὲ ἀρχάγγελος τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρινόμενος εἶπεν· "Ἐπιτιμῆσαι σοὶ Κύριος· ἀπὸ γὰρ πνεύματος ἁγίου αὐτοῦ πάντες ἐκτίσθημεν καὶ ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐξῆλθε τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ κόσμος ἐγένετο." (b) (Τότε) ὁ διάβολος ἐπήνεγκε ἔγκλημα

διὰ τὸν τοῦ Ἀιγυπτίου φόνον, (λέγων)· φοινεύς ἐστιν ὁ Μωυσῆς· διὰ τοῦτο οὐ συγχωρεῖται αὐτῷ τυχεῖν τῆς ἐννόμου ταφῆς.

iii. Τότε ὁ ἀρχάγγελος Μιχαὴλ τῷ διαβόλῳ διαλεγόμενος εἶπεν· “Σὺ ἐνέπνευσας τὸν ὄφιν ὥστε αἷτιον γενέσθαι τῆς παραβάσεως τοῦ Ἀδὰμ καὶ τῆς Εὔας.

iv. Καὶ τὸν Μωυσέα ἀναλαμβάνόμενον διττὸν εἶδεν Ἰησοῦς ὁ τοῦ Ναυῆ, καὶ τὸν μὲν μετ’ ἀγγέλων, τὸν δὲ ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη περὶ τὰς φάραγγας κηδεῖας ἀξιούμενον. εἶδεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὴν θεὰν ταύτην κάτω πνεύματι ἐπαρθεῖς σὺν καὶ τῷ Χαλέβ.

The passages from which we have constructed this sketch are as follows. After each passage I enclose in brackets numbers which show to what part of the above reconstruction the passage in question belongs.

St. Jude 9. ὁ δὲ Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος, ὅτε τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρινόμενος διελέγετο περὶ τοῦ Μωσέως σώματος, οὐκ ἐτόλμησε κρίσιν ἐπενεγκεῖν βλασφημίας, ἀλλ’ εἶπεν, Ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι Κύριος (ii.(a)).

Clement of Alexandria (Flor. 190–203 A.D.), *Strom.* vi. 15. Ἐικότως ἄρα καὶ τὸν Μωυσέα ἀναλαμβάνόμενον διττὸν εἶδεν Ἰησοῦς ὁ τοῦ Ναυῆ, καὶ τὸν μὲν μετ’ ἀγγέλων, τὸν δὲ ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη περὶ τὰς φάραγγας κηδεῖας ἀξιούμενον. εἶδεν δὲ Ἰησοῦς τὴν θεὰν ταύτην κάτω, πνεύματι ἐπαρθεῖς σὺν καὶ τῷ Χαλέβ· ἀλλ’ οὐχ ὁμοίως ἄμφω θεῶνται. ἀλλ’ ὁ μὲν καὶ θᾶπτον κατῆλθεν, πολὺ τὸ βρῖθον ἐπαγόμενος· ὁ δὲ ἐπικατελθὼν ὕστερον τὴν δόξαν διηγείτο, ἣν ἐθεᾶτο διαθρῆσαι δυνηθεῖς μᾶλλον θατέρου, ἅτε καὶ καθαρώτερος γενόμενος . . . δηλούσης, οἶμαι, τῆς ἱστορίας, μὴ πάντων εἶναι τὴν γνῶσιν (iv.).

Adumbrat. in Ep. Judae (Zahn’s *Supplementum Clementinum*, p. 84). “Quando Michael archangelus cum diabolo disputans altercabatur de corpore Moysi.” Hic confirmat Assumptionem Moysi (ii.).

Origen (185–254 A.D.). *De Princíp.* iii. 2. 1 (Lom-

matzsch, xxi. 303, 304). Et primo quidem in Genesi serpens Evam seduxisse describitur, de quo in Adscensione Mosis, cujus libelli meminit in epistola sua apostolus Judas, Michael archangelus cum diabolo disputans de corpore Mosis ait, a diabolo inspiratum serpentem causam exstitisse praevaricationis Adae et Evae (iii.).

In Josuam hom. ii. 1 (Lommatzsch, xi. 22). Denique et in libello quodam, licet in canone non habeatur, mysterii tamen hujus figura describitur. Refertur enim quia duo Moses videbantur, unus vivus in spiritu, alius mortuus in corpore. In quo hoc est nimirum quod adumbratur, quia si intuearis literam legis inanem et vacuum ab iis omnibus quae superius memoravimus, ipse est Moses mortuus in corpore. Si vero potes removere legis velamen, et intelligere, quia lex spiritualis est, iste est Moses, qui vivit in spiritu (iv.).

Didymus Alex. (309–394). *In Epist. Judae Enarratio* (Gallandi, *Bibliotheca Patrum*, vi. 307). In reference to Jude 9, Didymus writes: Adversarii hujus contemplationis praescribunt praesenti epistolae et Moyseos Assumptioni propter eum locum ubi significatur verbum Archangeli de corpore Moyseos ad diabolum factum (ii.(a)).

Evodius, contemporary of Augustine. *Epist. ad Augustin.* 258, vol. ii. p. 839, Ben. ed. 1836. Quanquam et in apocryphis et in secretis ipsius Moysi, quae scriptura caret auctoritate, tunc cum ascenderet in montem ut moreretur, vi corporis efficitur, ut aliud esset quod terrae mandaretur, aliud quod angelo comitanti sociaretur. Sed non satis urget me apocryphorum praeferre sententiam illis superioribus rebus definitis (iv.).

Severus, Patriarch of Antioch (512–519). (Cramer, *Cat. in Epist. Cathol.*, p. 160). Βουλόμενος ὁ Θεὸς τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ καὶ τοῦτο ὑποδείξει διὰ σωματικοῦ τύπου τινὸς,

παρεσκεύασεν ἐν τῇ τοῦ Μωυσέως ταφῇ φανῆναι ὑπ' ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῖς πρὸς τὴν περιστολὴν τοῦ σώματος καὶ τὴν ἐν τῇ γῇ νεμομισμένην κατάθεσιν, ἀνθιστάμενον ὥσπερ τὸν πονηρὸν δαίμονα καὶ ἀντιπράττοντα· καὶ τούτῳ τὸν Μιχαὴλ ἀγαθὸν ἄγγελον ὄντα προσυπαντῆσαι καὶ ἀποσοβῆσαι· καὶ μὴ ἐξουσιαστικῶς ἐπιτιμῆσαι, ἀλλὰ τῷ κυρίῳ τῶν ὅλων παραχωρῆσαι τῆς κατ' ἐκείνου κρίσεως, καὶ εἶπεν ἐπιτιμῆσαι σοι Κύριος (i. ? and ii.).

Acta Synodi Nicaen. II. 20 (Fabricius, i. 844). Ἐν βιβλίῳ δὲ Ἀναλήψεως Μωυσέως Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος διαλεγόμενος τῷ διαβόλῳ λέγει· ἀπὸ γὰρ πνεύματος ἁγίου αὐτοῦ πάντες ἐκτίσθημεν (ii.(a)).

Apollinarius (*Catena Niceph.* i. col. 1313). Σημειωτέον, ὅτι καὶ ἐν τοῖς χρόνοις Μωυσέως ἦσαν καὶ ἄλλαι βίβλοι, αἱ νῦν εἰσὶν ἀπόκρυφοι, ὡς δηλοῖ καὶ ἡ τοῦ Ἰούδα ἐπιστολὴ· ὅπου διδάσκει καὶ περὶ τοῦ Μωυσέως σώματος καὶ ἔνθα μέμνηται ὡς ἐκ παλαιᾶς Γραφῆς, Ἰδοὺ κύριος ἦξει καὶ τὸ ἐξῆς (i.-iv.).

The following anonymous writings are from Cramer's *Catena in Epist. Cathol.*, pp. 160-163. P. 160. ὁ δὲ Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος, ὅτι τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρινόμενος διελέγετο περὶ τοῦ Μωυσέως σώματος καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. Δείκνυσι καὶ τὴν παλαιὰν συμφωνοῦσαν τῇ καινῇ, καὶ ὑφ' ἐνὸς Θεοῦ δεδομένας· ὁ γὰρ διάβολος ἀντεῖχε θέλων ἀπατῆσαι, ὅτι ἐμὸν τὸ σῶμα ὡς τῆς ὕλης δεσπόζοντι· καὶ ἤκουσε παρὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου τὸ ἐπιτιμῆσαι σοι κύριος· τουτέστι ὁ Κύριος τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ πάσης σαρκός (ii.(a)).

P. 161. Λέγεται ὁ Μιχαὴλ περὶ τὴν τοῦ Μωυσέως σώματος διηκονηκέναι ταφὴν· τοῦ διαβόλου πρὸς τοῦτο ἀνθισταμένου (i.-ii.).

P. 163. τελευτήσαντος ἐν τῷ ὄρει Μωυσέως, ὁ Μιχαὴλ ἀποστέλλεται μεταθήσων τὸ σῶμα, εἶτα τοῦ διαβόλου κατὰ τοῦ Μωυσέως βλασφημοῦντος, καὶ φονέα ἀναγορεύοντες διὰ τὸ πατάξαι τὸν Αἰγύπτιον, οὐκ ἐνέγκων τὴν κατ' αὐτοῦ

βλασφημίαν ὁ ἄγγελος, “ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι ὁ Θεὸς” πρὸς τὸν διάβολον ἔφη (i. and ii.(b)).

The next two scholia on Jude 9 were first printed by C. F. Matthaei (*Sept. Epp. Cathol.*, Riga 1782, pp. 238, 239), the first from D, an 11th century MS. τελευτήσαντος ἐν τῷ ὄρει Μωυσέως ὁ ἀρχάγγελος Μιχαὴλ ἀποστέλλεται μεταθήσων τὸ σῶμα. ὁ οὖν διάβολος ἀντέειχε θέλων ἀπατῆσαι, λέγων ὅτι ἐμὸν τὸ σῶμα ὡς τῆς ὕλης δεσπόζοντι· ἦτοι διὰ τὸ πατάξαι τὸν Αἰγύπτιον βλασφημοῦντος κατὰ τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ φονέα ἀναγορεύσαντος, μὴ ἐνεγκὼν τὴν κατ’ αὐτοῦ βλασφημίαν ὁ ἄγγελος “Ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι ὁ Θεός,” πρὸς τὸν διάβολον ἔφη (i. and ii.(a) + (b)). It was Rönisch that first drew attention to this and the next scholion. The second scholion is from Œcumenius (*in. Epist. Jud.*, circ. 990), which Matthaei (*l.c.*) edited from a 12th or 13th century MS. Η. λέγεται ὁ Μιχαὴλ τῇ τοῦ Μωυσέως σώματος διακονικῆναι ταφῇ, τοῦ διαβόλου πρὸς τοῦτο ἀνθισταμένου (i. and ii.).

Finally, Œcumenius (*Comm. in Ep. Jud.*, p. 340, cited by Volkmar). ἡ δὲ περὶ τοῦ Μωυσέως σώματος κρίσις ἐστὶν αὕτη· λέγεται τὸν Μιχαὴλ τὸν ἀρχάγγελον τῇ τοῦ Μωυσέως ταφῇ δεδιηκονηκῆναι. τοῦ γὰρ διαβόλου τοῦτο μὴ καταδεχομένου, ἀλλ’ ἐπιφέροντος ἔγκλημα διὰ τὸν τοῦ Αἰγυπτίου φόνον, ὡς αἰτίου (so Hilgenfeld, from MS. αὐτοῦ) ὄντος τοῦ Μωυσέως, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μὴ συγχωρεῖσθαι αὐτῷ τυχεῖν τῆς ἐννόμου ταφῆς (i. and ii.(b)).

It will be observed that in all these passages there is not a single important statement which has not been incorporated in our sketch on p. 106.

APPENDIX ON I. 8



I HAVE just discovered that the text in I. 8, *ut inducat plebem in terram*, agrees with the Samaritan text, the Syriac and Vulgate Versions of Deut. xxxi. 7, **אָחָה תְּבִיא**, **אָחָה תְּבִיא**, against the Massoretic, LXX., and Targum of Onkelos, which have **תְּבִיא** = "thou shalt enter," and its equivalents, instead of **תְּבִיא**, "thou shalt cause to enter" or "thou shalt bring in."

INDEX I

PASSAGES FROM THE SCRIPTURES AND OTHER ANCIENT BOOKS DIRECTLY CONNECTED OR CLOSELY PARALLEL WITH THE TEXT

DEUTERONOMY.	ASSUMPTION OF MOSES.	ASSUMPTION OF MOSES.	PSALMS OF SOLOMON.*
xxx. 7.	I. 6.	III. 5.	x. 6.
7.	I. 8.	VII. 6.	iv. 23.
7.	I. 10.	7.	3, 4, 5.
xxxiii. 29.	X. 8.	9.	viii. 13.
1 SAMUEL.			APOCALYPSE OF BARUCH.
viii. 3.	V. 5.	III. 10-13.	lxxxiv. 2-5.
PSALMS.			
cxlv. 17.	III. 5.		
EZEKIEL.			ETHIOPIC ³ ENOCH.
viii. 9, 10.	II. 9.	X. 4.	i. 6.
DANIEL			WISDOM.
xii. 1.	VIII. 1.	XI. 16.	vii. 22.
ECCLESIASTICUS.			
vii. 24.	XI. 12.		
25.	„		
xxvi. 28.	„		
ST. MATTHEW.			THUCYDIDES.
xxiv. 21.	VIII. 1.	XI. 8.	ii. 43.
29.	X. 5.		
ACTS.			
vii. 36.	III. 11.		
2 PETER.	GREEK FRAGMENT.		SOURCE OF QUOTATION
ii. 10-11.		V. 3.	UNKNOWN.
JUDE.	GREEK FRAGMENT.		
9.			
16.	v. 5 ; vii. 7, 9.		
18.	vii. 1, 3.		

* See Psalms of Solomon (Ryle and James's ed.), p. lxx.

INDEX II

NAMES AND SUBJECTS.

- ADVENT of God, X. 12.
 Amorites, XI. 11, 16.
 Antiochus Epiphanes, VIII. 1.
 Antiochian persecution, VIII. 1-5.
 Apollinarius, quotation from the Assumption in, p. 109.
 Aramaic, alleged, original of the Assumption, pp. xxxix-xli.
- BALDENSPERGER, pp. xxvii, lvii, 12, 25.
 Baruch, Apocalypse of, quoted on, III. 10-13; IV. 8.
 Black, J. S., p. x.
 Briggs, p. xxviii.
- CALAMITIES of Judah ascribed to Israel, III. 5.
 Caleb, pp. 106, 107.
 Canaan, conquest of, II. 2.
 Carriere, pp. xxiv, 35.
 Ceriani, pp. xiii, xviii.
 Chasids, rise of the, V. 2, note.
 Cheyne, pp. x, 42, 88.
 Chronology of Book, p. lx; I. 2, note.
 Clement of Alexandria, quotations from the Assumption in, p. 107.
 Colani, pp. xxiii-xxiv, lv, 24, 28, 35.
 Colony, *i.e.* Jerusalem, III. 2, note; V. 6; VI. 9.
 Covenant of the Lord, I. 9, note, 14; II. 7; III. 9; IV. 5; XI. 17; XII. 13.
 Cyrus, IV. 6.
- DANIEL, IV. 1.
 „ prayer of, IV. 2-4.
 Deane, p. xxvii.
 De Faye, p. xxviii.
 Didymus, quotation from the Assumption in, p. 108.
 Dillmann, pp. xxvi, lvii, 23.
 Drummond, pp. xxv, lvii, 23.
- EGYPT, III. 11.
 Emendations or restorations of the Latin Version by—
 Cheyne, X. 8.
 Fritzsche, V. 5.
 Gutschmidt, XI. 7; XII. 9.
 Hilgenfeld, II. 4; VI. 6, 7; VII. 1, 3, 8; X. 1; XI. 14; XII. 9.
 Rönisch, VI. 3; VII. 1; IX. 2; XI. 2, 11, 12; XII. 6.
 Schmidt-Merx, I. 8; II. 4; III. 4; VIII. 1; IX. 1; X. 12, 15; XI. 4, 9, 17.
 Volkmar, V. 3; VII. 6, 10; XII. 6.
 Wieseler, V. 5.
 the Editor, I. 10; II. 3, 4, 9; III. 12, 13; V. 6; VI. 1; VII. 4, 7; VIII. 2; X. 5; XI. 12, 16, 17; XII. 4.
 „ of the Latin through re-translation into Greek, II. 7; III. 4; IV. 3; VII. 7; XI. 11.

Emendations or restorations of the Latin through retranslation into Hebrew by—
 Rosenthal, I. 10 [18 (?) ; IV. 9 (?)].
 the Editor, I. 7, 10, 13 ; IV. 9 ; V. 5 ; VII. 4 (?) ; X. 3, 4, 9, 10.
 Enoch, Ethiopic, quoted on, X. 4, 9.
 Evodius, quotation from the Assumption in, p. 108.
 Ewald, pp. xxi, lvii.
 Ezra, 4, quoted on, X. 5, 7, 10.
 FABRICIUS, p. xlviii.
 Fast of three days, IX. 6.
 Fritzsche, pp. xx-xxi, lvi, 73.
 GEHENNA, X. 10.
 Geiger, pp. xxiv-xxv.
 Gelasius of Cyzicum quoted, I. 14, note.
 Gentiles, I. 13 ; IV. 9 ; VIII. 3 ; X. 7.
 God, titles of—
 Creator, X. 10.
 Eternal God, X. 7.
 God, I. 10 ; IV. 2, 5 ; V. 4 ; IX. 4 ; X. 9 ; XI. 16 ; XII. 4, 9, 10, 13.
 God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, III. 9.
 God of our fathers, IX. 6.
 God of heaven, II. 4.
 Heaven, III. 8.
 Heavenly One, X. 3.
 King on the lofty throne, IV. 2.
 Lord, I. 6, 18 ; II. 2, 7, 9 ; III. 2, 5 ; V. 6 ; IX. 3, 7 ; XI. 15, 16, 17.
 Lord of all, IV. 2.
 Lord of their fathers, IV. 8.
 Lord of heaven, IV. 4.
 Lord of the world, I. 11.
 Lord of lords, IX. 6.
 Most High, X. 7.

HAUPT, p. xxii.
 Hausrath, pp. xxv, 35.
 Hebrew original of the Assumption, pp. xxxviii-xlv.
 Heidenheim, pp. xxv, 48.
 Hermas quoted, p. 5.
 Herod the Great, VI. 2-7.
 High priests, Hellenising, under Antiochus Epiph., V. 3-4, notes.
 High priests, Maccabean, VI. 1, notes.
 Hilgenfeld, pp. xviii-xix, xx, xxii, xxxviii, lvi, 23, 35, etc.
 ISRAEL, God's elect people, pp. lviii-lx ; IV. 2.
 „ solidarity of, pp. lviii-lx.
 „ world created on behalf of, I. 12.
 „ exalted into heaven, X. 9.
 Israel's triumph over Rome, X. 8.
 JAMES, pp. xvii, 25.
 Josephus, referred to, *passim*.
 „ quoted, p. 1 ; II. 3 ; VI. 3 ; VII. 3-10 ; VIII. 1, 3, 4, 5 ; IX. 6 ; XII. 6 ; p. 71.
 Joshua, I. 6, 9 ; X. 11, 15 ; XI. 1, 3 ; XII. 1, 3, 8.
 Judah carried into captivity, III. 1-3.
 „ persecuted by the Seleucidæ, V. 1.
 „ persecuted by Antiochus Epiph., VIII. 1.
 Judgment, final, X. 3-8.
 KEIM, p. lvi.
 Law, the keeping of the, the end of life, IX. 6.
 Langen, pp. xxi.
 Latin Version of the Assumption, pp. xxviii-xxxvi.
 MACCABEAN high priests, VI. 1.

THEOLOGICAL WORKS

PUBLISHED BY

ADAM & CHARLES BLACK

SOHO SQUARE

LONDON, W.

BY THE LATE
W. ROBERTSON SMITH, M.A., LL.D.,
PROFESSOR OF ARABIC IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

LECTURES ON
THE RELIGION OF THE SEMITES.
THE FUNDAMENTAL INSTITUTIONS.

New Edition. Revised throughout by the Author.

Demy 8vo, price 15s. net.

THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE JEWISH
CHURCH.

A COURSE OF LECTURES ON BIBLICAL
CRITICISM.

Second Edition. Revised and much Enlarged.

Demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d.

THE PROPHETS OF ISRAEL,
AND
THEIR PLACE IN HISTORY TO THE CLOSE OF THE
EIGHTH CENTURY, B.C.

With Introduction and additional Notes

BY THE REV. T. K. CHEYNE, M.A., D.D.,
ORIEL PROFESSOR OF THE INTERPRETATION OF HOLY SCRIPTURE
AT OXFORD, CANON OF ROCHESTER.

New Edition.

Post 8vo, price 10s. 6d.

INTRODUCTION TO THE BOOK OF ISAIAH.

WITH AN APPENDIX CONTAINING THE
UNDOUBTED PORTIONS OF THE TWO
CHIEF PROPHETIC WRITERS
IN A TRANSLATION.

BY THE REV. T. K. CHEYNE, M.A., D.D.,
ORIEL PROFESSOR OF THE INTERPRETATION OF HOLY SCRIPTURE
AT OXFORD, AND FORMERLY FELLOW OF BALLIOL
COLLEGE, CANON OF ROCHESTER.

Demy 8vo, price 24s.

SKETCHES FROM EASTERN HISTORY.

BY PROFESSOR T. NÖLDEKE.

TRANSLATED BY
JOHN SUTHERLAND BLACK, M.A., LL.D.

Demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d.

HISTORY OF ISRAEL AND JUDAH.

BY PROFESSOR JULIAN WELLHAUSEN.

Third Edition.

Crown 8vo, price 5s.

SOURCES OF THE APOSTOLIC CANONS.

BY PROFESSOR ADOLF HARNACK.

TRANSLATED BY LEONARD A. WHEATLEY.

With an Introductory Essay on the Organisation of the
Early Church and the Evolution of the Reader.

BY THE REV. JOHN OWEN.

Demy 8vo, price 7s. 6d. net.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

CHRISTIANITY AND HISTORY.

'Translated, with the Author's sanction, by

T. BAILEY SAUNDERS, with an Introductory Note.

Crown 8vo, price 1s. 6d. net.

MONISM; OR, THE CONFESSION OF FAITH OF A MAN OF SCIENCE.

BY PROFESSOR ERNST HAECKEL.

Translated from the German by J. D. F. GILCHRIST.

Crown 8vo, price 1s. 6d. net.

OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY.

BY ARCHIBALD DUFF, M.A. LL.D.

Demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d.

A MANUAL OF THEOLOGY.

BY THOMAS B. STRONG, M.A.

Crown 8vo, price 5s.

NATURAL THEOLOGY

(THE GIFFORD LECTURES, 1891, 1893).

BY PROFESSOR SIR GEORGE G. STOKES, BART.

Two Vols. crown 8vo, price 3s. 6d. each.

A SHORT HISTORY OF SYRIAC LITERATURE.

BY PROFESSOR W. WRIGHT.

Crown 8vo, price 6s. net.

PASSAGES OF THE BIBLE.

Chosen for their literary beauty and interest.

BY J. G. FRAZER,

FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

Crown 8vo, price 6s.

HANDBOOK TO CHRISTIAN AND ECCLESIASTICAL ROME.

BY H. M. AND M. A. R. T.

PART I.—THE CHRISTIAN MONUMENTS.

*Crown 8vo, bound in buckram, limp, with rounded corners,
Illustrated, price 7s. 6d.*

In the Press.

A DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE.

Edited by the Rev. T. K. CHEYNE, M.A., LL.D., Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture at Oxford, and formerly Fellow of Balliol College, Canon of Rochester; and J. S. BLACK, M.A., LL.D, assisted by the following Contributors:—

- | | |
|---|---|
| ABBOTT (Rev. Dr. E. A.). | KING (L. W.), British Museum. |
| ADDIS (Rev. W. E.). | KOSTERS (Prof.), Leyden. |
| BENNETT (Prof.), Hackney. | M'LEAN (N.), Cambridge. |
| BENZINGER (Dr.), Tübingen. | MARTI (Prof. KARL), Basel. |
| BEVAN (Prof.), Cambridge. | MASSIE (JOHN), Oxford. |
| BOUSSET (Lic. W.), Göttingen. | MEYER (Prof. ED.), Halle. |
| BROWN (Prof. FRANCIS), New York. | MOORE (Prof. G. F.), Andover. |
| BRUCE (Prof. A. B.), Glasgow. | MÜLLER (Prof. W. M.), Philadelphia. |
| BUDDE (Prof.), Strassburg. | NÖLDEKE (Prof.), Strassburg. |
| BURKITT (F. C.), Cambridge. | RIDGEWAY (Prof.), Cambridge. |
| CHARLES (Rev. R. H.), Oxford. | ROBINSON (Prof. J. A.), Cambridge. |
| CONE (Dr. O.), Buchtel College. | ROGERS (Prof. R. W.), Madison. |
| COOK (S. A.), Cambridge. | SANDAY (Prof.), Oxford. |
| COWLEY (A. E.), Oxford. | SCHMIDT (Prof. N.), Cornell University. |
| CREIGHTON (Dr. C.). | SCHMIEDEL (Prof.) Zurich. |
| DÄVIDSON (Prof. A. B.), Edinburgh. | SHIPLEY (A. E.), Cambridge. |
| DAVIES (Prof. T. W.), Nottingham. | SMITH (Prof. G. A.), Glasgow. |
| DRIVER (Prof.), Oxford. | SMITH (the Late Prof. ROBERTSON). |
| GASTER (Dr. M.), London. | SOCIN (Prof.), Leipzig. |
| GRAY (G. B.), Oxford. | SODEN (Prof. VON), Berlin. |
| GUTHE (Prof.), Leipzig. | SPITTA (Prof.), Strassburg. |
| HAUPT (Prof.), Johns Hopkins University. | STADE (Prof.), Giessen. |
| HEADLAM (Rev. A. C.), Oxford. | THISELTON-DYER (Dr. W. T.), Director, Royal Gardens, Kew. |
| HOGG (Rev. H. W.), Oxford. | TIELE (Prof.), Leyden. |
| JAMES (Dr.), Cambridge. | TOY (Prof.), Harvard. |
| JASTROW (Prof.), Pennsylvania University. | WELLHAUSEN (Prof.), Marburg. |
| JEREMIAS (Dr.), Leipzig. | WHITEHOUSE (Prof.), Cheshunt College. |
| JÜLICHER (Prof.), Marburg. | WOODHOUSE (W. J.), Oxford. |
| KAMPHAUSEN (Prof.), Bonn. | ZIMMERN (Prof.), Leipzig. |
| KAUTZSCH (Prof.), Halle. | |
| KENNEDY (Prof. A. R. S.), Edinburgh. | |



